

Classical Philology

VOLUME X

October 1915

NUMBER 4

THE COLONIZING POLICY OF THE ROMANS FROM 123 TO 31 B.C.

BY FRANK FROST ABBOTT

In this paper an attempt has been made to note some of the changes which the colonizing policy of Rome underwent in the period of the Revolution, and to connect each of them with the political situation out of which it came.¹ In no phase of her political life during this period are the coming of the Empire and the reorganization of society more clearly foreshadowed than in her colonial history. The democratic tendency of the times, the movement toward the centralization of power in the hands of one man, the increasing influence of the army in politics, the development of the imperial idea, and the growth of a more intelligent interest in the welfare of the provinces may be seen even more clearly in the changes which the attitude of the Romans toward colonies underwent than in the transformations which the government at Rome was undergoing.

These changes are brought to light by comparing the steps taken toward colonization in the years 133-31 B.C. with those of the older Republic and the Empire. Under the Republic we find two great

¹ Admirable accounts of Roman colonization have been given by De Ruggiero in the *Dizionario Epigrafico* (separately issued as *Le Colonie dei Romani*) and by Kornemann in the Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll *Realencyclopädie*, IV, coll. 511-88, and for many of the facts on which this interpretation is based reference may be made to those articles.

classes of colonies, the *coloniae Latinorum* and the *coloniae civium Romanorum*. So far as Italy was concerned, the former include the early establishments effected by the Latin League and the colonies founded after 389 by Rome acting alone. The last of these settlements was made in 181 B.C., so that there were no Latin colonies sent out to points in Italy after the time of the Gracchi. The most characteristic feature of the *coloniae civium Romanorum* was the fact that they were established on the coast, at such points as Minturnae, Sinuessa, Sena Gallica, and Croton. This practice was followed without exception up to 183 B.C., when the rule was broken by sending Roman colonies to Mutina, Parma, and Saturnia. Perhaps this change in policy, so far as Mutina and Parma were concerned, was due to the feeling that the resistance of the Boii had been so fierce and so persistent that Latins could not be trusted to hold them in check. This element in the situation at least justified the procedure, but more probably the choice of Romans for these inland colonies was a part of the policy of social regeneration of Cato, in whose censorship these three colonies were sent out. This view gains some probability from the fact that, although usually only a few hundred men were sent to a Roman colony, two thousand settlers were assigned to Mutina and the same number to Parma. It may have been Cato's object to provide for some of the needy citizens of Rome. If it was, the case of these two towns furnishes an interesting precedent for the Gracchan colonies. The Roman colonies were first of all sent out for purposes of defense; the Latin colonies served as military outposts and as centers of Roman influence. To hold and Romanize the provinces by means of founding colonies in them was not the policy of the Republic. It was a method employed in Italy only. Consequently, since Italy was completely subdued by the time of the Gracchi, the necessity of establishing colonies for defense ceased to exist, and only one colony, primarily of this sort, was founded in the subsequent Republican period, viz., Eporodia in Transpadane Gaul, established in 100 B.C. This town was located at the southern end of the Great St. Bernard Pass, and, in view of the exceptional character which its situation gave it, its establishment is only an isolated instance of a return to the earlier policy.

With the Gracchi, as is well known, a change in the motives for colonization came in. The purpose of Tiberius was to relieve the needy population of Rome and to promote the prosperity of the country districts. He sought to accomplish his object by placing individual settlers on the reclaimed public land. Gaius had the same purpose in mind, but his plan differed from that of his brother, in that he proposed to plant colonies. His colonies were also to provide opportunities for men of a class different from those for whom Tiberius was solicitous. The colonists were to be men of approved character¹ and were drawn from among the less fortunate merchants and artisans. This second conclusion seems to follow from the sites which he selected for his settlements, viz., Colonia Minervia (=Scolacium), Colonia Neptunia (=Tarentum), and Colonia Iunonia (=Carthago). All of these places were on the coast and had excellent locations for commercial purposes. His attempt to send a colony to Capua also confirms this view. A settlement there would naturally become an important center for Campanian trade.

The change from the earlier Republican policy in all these cases is clear. These colonies were not to protect the frontier or hold important strategic points, but to provide better opportunities for a livelihood for the unsuccessful and to develop Roman territory. It will be noticed that regard was had not only to the extremely poor but to the lower middle class. The plan had its political side because Gaius wished to enlist the support of all elements outside the oligarchy, the commercial classes as well as the proletariat.

The establishment of two colonies in Southeastern Italy and a third at Carthage looks like a well thought-out plan to bring the trade and banking interests of the Eastern Mediterranean basin into Roman hands. It indicates the rapid growth of the commercial spirit, as does the settlement of many individual Roman merchants at Alexandria and Delos in the same period. The founding of these trading colonies would supplement the agrarian measures of Gaius by furnishing a new outlet for Italian energy and capital, and would thus improve the financial condition of the peninsula. From the political point of view the movement is especially significant of the

¹ Plut. *C. Gracch.* 9.

growing influence of the commercial classes in directing the policy of the government, and coincides in a noteworthy way with a change in the provincial policy of Rome. Down to 146 B.C. she had organized only three provinces, viz., Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica, and Spain. These territories were taken under Roman rule, the last of them in 197 B.C., as an outcome of the Punic wars, to protect Rome against her great rival. When the victories over Macedonia and Syria came in the first half of the second century B.C., Rome refrained from adding any territory to the Empire, but contented herself with securing a balance of power in the East. But with the middle of the second century a change comes over her policy. From 146 to 120 B.C. five new provinces were annexed, viz., Africa, Illyricum and Macedonia, Achaëa, Asia, and Gallia Narbonensis. The failure of the old plan to secure peace was doubtless one reason for the change, but we may well see also in this reversal of the earlier method of dealing with conquered territory the increasing power of the commercial and banking interests at Rome.

The senatorial attack on the colonizing plans of Gaius took a double form. Drusus, the champion of the senate, cleverly outbid Gracchus for popular favor by proposing that twelve new colonies, each of three thousand citizens, should be sent out. He probably had no intention of carrying out this plan, but it served well his purpose of estranging the people from his opponent. The fact that Junonia was to be established on the site of Carthage, whose soil had been put under a perpetual curse by Scipio, furnished the second point for attack, and the unfavorable omens which attended the settlement of the colony materially strengthened the senatorial case. It does not seem probable that the senate was unalterably opposed to the general policy of establishing colonies for the help of the citizens. This method of meeting the pressure for relief would be far less objectionable to it than the division of the *ager publicus*, which would bring a great loss to the capitalist, because it would involve a resumption by the government of vast tracts of land occupied by him. In fact the colonies at Tarentum and Scolacium seem to have been authorized by a *senatus consultum*, but the senatorial party was hostile to the colonizing plans of Gracchus, because he was sponsor for them, and it felt that by wrecking them it might

destroy his political influence. These expectations were well founded, for Junonia became the storm-center in the struggle, and the popular hostility to the establishment of a colony there broke the prestige of Gracchus. The foundation at Junonia was selected for attack, as we have noticed, partly because the hatred of Carthage, the fear of seeing her prosperity revived, and anxiety lest the gods might be displeased by neglect of Scipio's dedication of Carthage to the gods of the lower world rendered it probable that a successful appeal could be made to popular prejudice.

Arguments based on these considerations were primarily for popular use. How much they weighed with the senate we cannot tell. Other, and more serious, objections to Junonia presented themselves to the adherents of the old régime. Foremost among these was the fact that it was a transmarine colony and a *colonia civium Romanorum*. The founding of colonies outside Italy was essentially an innovation, and Rome was constitutionally opposed to all innovations. It obscured too the distinction which she had always made between Italy and the provinces. Romans had come to recognize the fact that the peninsula was a geographical and political unit, with Rome as its capital. The maintenance of law and order, the acceptance of Roman ideas, a reasonably considerate treatment of the Italians, and a corresponding loyalty on their part were essential to the security of the capital. These objects could be attained in no better way than by establishing throughout the peninsula colonies which would be bound closely to Rome by the special privileges received from the mother-city. No such strong motives operated in the case of the provinces. The control of them was in the hands of the soldiers; their Romanization could be left to the individual trader, money-lender, and tax-gatherer. The conception of the city-state, unique in its privileges and its powers, had weakened somewhat, so far as Italy was concerned, but it was maintained over against the world outside the peninsula. Furthermore, by planting a transmarine colony on the coast the Roman feared that he might be raising up a rival to his own city. Outside of Italy, Rome's policy had been to destroy such rivals rather than to build them up. From the geographical and commercial points of view the choice of Carthage by Gracchus as the site for his trans-

marine colony was admirable; from the sentimental point of view it was disastrous. To what extent the Romans appreciated the geographical disadvantage under which their city lay in its efforts to secure the commerce of the world we cannot say, but they must have realized the fact that the location of Carthage was much better than that of Rome to secure the trade of the East where the greatest possibilities for seagoing trade then lay. The commercial pre-eminence of Carthage in the early days would have brought this home to them, if a mere contemplation of the long and dangerous voyage around Italy had not done so.

A serious objection to the establishment of transmarine colonies which we have not thus far considered lay in the fact that, according to Republican theory, land in the provinces belonged to the Roman state, and contributed to the Roman treasury. To grant it to colonists would materially lessen the revenues of the state. Perhaps it would be attributing too great foresight to the aristocracy to suppose that it feared lest a loss of revenue from the provinces would be made up by the imposition of indirect taxes which would fall largely on well-to-do citizens, but it is not outside the range of possibility. The *uicesima libertatis*, a 5 per cent tax, already existed under the Republic, and Augustus found it necessary to establish an inheritance tax of 5 per cent and to put a charge on goods sold at auction.

One more objection to the founding of colonies in the provinces remains to be mentioned. The contrast which would be set up between such settlements enjoying Latin or Roman rights and the neighboring native towns would call the attention of the latter to their own unfortunate position, and either breed discontent in them or raise in their minds the unwarranted hope of attaining some of the advantages of Roman citizenship. This danger must have been brought home to the Romans at this moment by the situation in Italy. Roman colonies were scattered through the peninsula, and the advantages which they enjoyed were so impressed upon the neighboring Italians that there was an ominous murmur of discontent in the Italian communities. To create a similar or worse situation in the provinces would seem the height of folly. In this connection it may be noted that in proposing the establishment of a

transmarine colony probably Gracchus had no intention of taking a step toward the improvement of the political or social condition of the provincials. So far as we can see, there is none among his many reforms which looks to the betterment of the provinces. In fact his most noteworthy measure concerning the provinces, the one providing that the contracts for the collection of Asian taxes should be let in Rome, seems to have been prejudicial to the provincials, and to have been introduced for the purpose of bringing a larger revenue to the state.¹

It has been often said that there was no popular pressure for the establishment of colonies in the provinces, that the Roman and the Italian did not look kindly on the thought of perpetual exile from Italy, and that they went out to the provinces as traders, bankers, or tax-gatherers, but always with the expectation of coming back to Italy to enjoy the profits of their enforced stay abroad. As traders in a native provincial town they were still Romans, but to be enrolled for a transmarine colony and to become citizens of Junonia or of Corinth severed their sentimental connection with the capital. Cicero's discontent with the barrenness of provincial life comes to one's mind in this connection. The steady growth of Rome may furnish proof of its attractiveness for the common man also, and at a later date Cicero, in opposing the agrarian plans of Rullus, dwells upon the drawbacks of country life as compared with life in the capital. This view of the attitude of the Roman toward permanent residence in the provinces is probably correct, and yet it is to be noticed that several thousand people enrolled for the colony at Junonia.

The struggle between Gracchus and the senate over the establishment of this colony ended in a compromise. The Rubrian Law which authorized it was repealed. Consequently the community as a colony ceased to exist, but the settlers retained their assignments of land free from tribute.

The fact has been mentioned that the founding of transmarine colonies was out of harmony with Roman policy. It was not, however, without precedent. Such colonies had been planted at Carteia and Valentia in Spain in 171 and 138 B.C., respectively, and at Palma

¹ Cf. Frank, *Roman Imperialism*, p. 249.

and Pollentia in the Balearic Isles in 123 B.C. The colonists of Carteia, Livy tells us, were the sons of Roman soldiers and Spanish women. To a delegation of these people the senate granted the right to found a Latin colony at Carteia, and four thousand of them with their freedmen settled there. The character of the colonists was exceptional; they made a definite request of the senate, and their settlement merely involved their transfer from one point in a province to another. All these circumstances made the case exceptional, and it could scarcely serve as a precedent for the future. The colonists at Valentia were drawn from the army of Viriathus. Perhaps in both cases sentiment was one of the motives which led the senate to deviate from its accepted policy. Palma and Pollentia on the island of Majorca were settled by Roman citizens brought over from Spain, several thousand in number. The military necessity for taking such a step can be easily understood. The people of the islands were barbarous, and individual traders could not have settled among them with safety. It is not so easy to explain the political side of the matter. When we recall the violent opposition of the senate to the plan of establishing a colony at Junonia, it is surprising that this body should accept at the same moment a measure providing for the founding of two other transmarine colonies. The colonies were led out by Q. Caecilius Metellus, a member of one of the leading senatorial families. The fact that the senate adopted this measure makes it probable that the land occupied by the colonists was not allowed to be free from tribute, for, as we shall presently see, that was one of the vital questions raised in connection with the early colonies planted outside of Italy.

This was one of the points at issue in the case of Narbo Martius, founded in 118 B.C. in Gallia Narbonensis. Herzog long ago noticed¹ the coincidence in point of time between the pacification of this province and the ascendancy of C. Gracchus. Through this strip of land in Southern Gaul lay the road to the rich province of Spain; it was essential to the Italian trader that it should be in the hands of Rome, and it was the commercial class which led the government to bring this district under its control. It was for the merchant too that the colony of Narbo Martius was founded on the river Atax

¹ *Gall. Narb. . . . Hist.*, pp. 49-50.

at the junction of the roads running west and south, and at a very promising point for trade. The settlement was to be a colony of Roman citizens located in a province. It was therefore open to all the general objections which had always been urged against the planting of such colonies. Furthermore, the development of trade from Narbo as a center could hardly fail to lead in time to further conquest and expansion. We are not surprised, therefore, to find that the senate, or at least a part of it, opposed the plan.¹ At Narbo, as in the case of Junonia, the form which the ownership of the allotments should take was the central point of the discussion. For Junonia, Gracchus had carried through his project of establishing a colony in which the allotments of land should be held as private property and should be free from tribute. This was in violation of the established policy of the Republic, and in the reaction which followed the downfall of Gaius Gracchus, that portion of the Rubrian Law which made the settlement a colony was repealed. In the case of Narbo the establishment of the colony was allowed, but the state retained the ultimate ownership of the land.² Nothing marks more clearly the intention of the Republic to keep the provinces in a permanent state of inferiority and dependence than her consistent refusal to recognize the right of the private ownership of land in the provinces.³ Exceptional circumstances had led to the founding of Carteia, Valentia, Palma, and Pollentia, and Junonia lost its title of colony. But the settlement at Narbo was not the outcome of any peculiar situation, and, except for the limited right of ownership to which its citizens were subject, it enjoyed the same rights and privileges as the Roman colonies of Italy and Cisalpine Gaul. Consequently it furnishes the first clear precedent of a colony outside the peninsula. The fact that Narbo could be thought of as lying upon an extended portion of the peninsula made it easier to overcome the prejudice against colonies outside of Italy than would have been the case with a proposed colony across the sea. With the planting of this colony the first stage in the recasting of Republican policy in the matter of colonizing comes to an end. In the first place

¹ Cic. *Brut.* 160; *Pro Cluent.* 140.

² Mommsen, *St. R.*, III, 736.

³ Cf. *ibid.*, III, 733 f.

strategic considerations are no longer paramount. The relief of the unfortunate and the development of trade have become the impelling motives. Secondly, a precedent has been set for the planting of colonies outside of Italy or Cisalpine Gaul.

The Democratic party under Marius and Saturninus took up the Gracchan policy of planting transmarine colonies, and in 100 B.C. the tribune Saturninus put through bills which provided for the founding of colonies in Africa, Sicily, Achaea, and Macedonia. After the downfall of Saturninus these measures were repealed,¹ but we know of the establishment of at least one transmarine colony at this time, viz., the *colonia Mariana* on the island of Corsica. The Democratic legislation of this period carried out the Gracchan policy in one other particular, but applied it in a new way. Before the time of Marius only those who possessed a fixed property qualification were admitted to service in a legion. Marius opened the ranks to the proletariat. Consequently, when his army was disbanded, there was a large number of needy soldiers for whom some provision had to be made. Marius wished to see them rewarded; the Democratic party favored the plan, and the senate must have seen the danger of allowing them to remain in Rome. This situation led to the passage of laws establishing colonies to receive them, and in this way the first colonies of veterans were founded. At the same time the Democratic party took another step forward in the way of granting state aid. Hitherto the *ager publicus* had been used for colonies. The *lex Appuleia* of 100 B.C. authorized the purchase of land from private owners by the state for allotment to the settlers.

One of the most interesting phases of the colonizing policy of the Democrats is its tendency to grant the same rights in the peninsula north of the Po as south of it, to raise Italy to an equality with Rome, and to put the provinces on a par with Italy. The persistent attempts, some of them successful, to plant colonies in the provinces tended to obliterate the sharp line of distinction which had been drawn between the provinces and Italy. The invitation which Gracchus gave to the Italians to enrol themselves for the colony at Junonia, and the provision of the *lex Appuleia* which authorized Marius to confer the right of Roman citizenship on three Italians

¹ Cic. *De leg.*, ii. 14.

in each of his colonies were both steps toward putting Rome and the rest of Italy on the same basis.

As early as the beginning of the third century B.C., by establishing a Roman colony at Sena Gallica, the Romans recognized the right to the full ownership of land in Cisalpine Gaul,¹ although that district lay outside the boundaries of Italy proper as much as Sicily did. In this respect then Cisalpine Gaul was granted the same privileges as Italy. It was a logical extension of this conception of a Greater Italy when, in 89 B.C., as a result of the Social War, the rights of Latin colonies were granted to Bergomum, Mantua, Ver-cellae, and several other towns in Transpadane Gaul. The importance of this action cannot be overestimated. It set a precedent which in time led to giving the title of colony with the accompanying rights and privileges even to towns in the provinces.

With the dictatorship of Sulla a revolutionary change in the Republican method of procedure comes in. Up to 82 B.C. no colony could be planted until a measure had been passed in the popular assembly authorizing it. Sulla drew his right to found colonies from the *lex Valeria* of 82 B.C., which not only named him *dictator legibus scribendis et rei publicae constituendae*, but conferred upon him among other powers this particular function. This general empowering act of course put in his hands the right to determine the site and size of each colony, and the size of the allotments, to choose the commissioners, and to arrange all the details which previously had been fixed for a colony in the law which provided for its establishment. Most of the land for these colonies was secured by confiscation. Never before had colonization been carried out on such a large scale. At least one hundred and twenty thousand soldiers² were provided with allotments in perhaps seventeen³ different colonies. Probably Sulla, in providing for his veterans in this way, hoped that these settlements scattered throughout Italy would make him and his new constitution secure.

From the time of Sulla's dictatorship on to the establishment of the Empire no important changes in matters of principle or

¹ Mommsen, *St. R.*, III, 734, n. 2.

² Cf. Appian *Bell. Civ.* i. 100; Livy, *Ep.* 89.

³ Cf. Kornemann, Pauly-Wissowa, *Realenc.*, IV, coll. 522-23; De Ruggiero, *Le Colonie dei Romani*, p. 129.

procedure were introduced into the colonizing policy of the Romans, or—to put it in another way—for every deviation which we find in the last years of the Republic from the established practices of the earlier Republic a precedent can be found in the period from 123 to 82 B.C. This of course does not mean that Caesar did little to mold the colonial policy of the Romans. Indeed, it was he who gave it a permanent form, a form which was taken over without essential change by Augustus and his successors.

For nearly twenty years after the dictatorship of Sulla we have no record of any colonial legislation. The subject was revived, however, by the ambitious measure proposed by the tribune Rullus in 63 B.C. The details of this bill have fortunately been set down for us in Cicero's three orations delivered against it. The plan resembled the colonizing measures of Gaius Gracchus rather than those of Marius and Sulla, in that it was primarily intended to provide for civilians, not for veterans. Some of them were to be settled in Italian towns already in existence; for others colonies were to be established in the *Ager Campanus* and *Campus Stellatis*.¹ At Capua, for instance, a colony of five thousand was to be planted, and in one of the most vigorous passages of his attack upon the law,² Cicero appeals to the traditional hatred of Capua, and tries to arouse the fear that she may become again a rival of Rome. In making this point he is using the same argument which probably the senatorial leaders of an earlier generation had used against the proposed settlements of Gaius Gracchus at Capua and Carthage. Land was to be bought for the allotments by the sale of *ager publicus* in Italy and the provinces, and by the imposition of a heavy tax on the public land in the provinces still retained by the state. A very large sum of money would thus be placed at the disposal of the commissioners, who were to hold office for five years and enjoy an almost unlimited power in carrying out the plan. To what extent the bill was intended as a serious measure to relieve conditions in Rome it is hard to say. Without doubt Caesar was vitally interested in it, and, as Lange holds,³ it may have been primarily intended to advance

¹ Cic. *De leg. agr.* i. 5. 16 ff.; i. 6. 18 ff.; ii. 27. 73 ff.; iii. 4. 15.

² *Ibid.*, i. 6. 18.

³ Lange, *Römische Alterthümer*, III², 239; cf. Frank, *Roman Imperialism*, p. 333.

his political fortunes. He could count on being one of the commissioners, and the long term of service, with the extraordinary powers to be granted to the commission by the popular assembly, would help to break down the oligarchical tradition that a magistrate should hold office for a year only and be responsible to the senate for his action. Probably the looseness with which the bill was drawn up, and the wide discretion which it would have given to the commission, contributed to bring about its defeat.

Caesar returned to his attack on the *Ager Campanus* and the *Campus Stellatis* in 59 B.C. His purpose now was to provide for the veterans of Pompey, and with the help of Pompey his agrarian law was carried in spite of the vigorous efforts of the senate to save the rich lands of Campania, and in spite of the loss of revenue which would result when they were given up by the state. Under this law colonies were planted at Capua, Calatia, and Casilinum. In the twenty-eight years which intervene between the establishment of these colonies and the battle of Actium some twenty-six other Roman colonies were founded in Italy.¹

But a still more important feature of his colonizing policy lay in the efforts which he made to Romanize the provinces. His first step in this direction was to secure the rights of Roman citizenship for the Transpadane Gauls in 49 B.C. Probably two motives influenced him largely in taking this action. He wished to repay the Transpadane region for its loyal support of his cause,² and to make the Alps the political boundary of Italy to the north. This grant was not entirely out of harmony with Republican theory, because the community of rights of Cisalpine Gaul and Italy proper had been recognized as early as 283 B.C., when a Roman colony was planted at Sena Gallica,³ and another step toward the inclusion of the Cisalpine region within the political limits of Italy was taken in 89 B.C. by granting the rights of Latin colonies to certain towns in this part of the peninsula.⁴ However, it violated the Republican principle that communities in the provinces should not receive Roman rights, for Cisalpine Gaul continued to be a province, or at least was not politically a part of Italy. Caesar violated Republican

¹ Cf. Kornemann, *op. cit.*, col. 524.

² Mommsen, *St. R.*, III, 734, n. 1.

³ Caesar *B.C.*, iii. 87. 4.

⁴ Cf. p. 375.

tradition in a more flagrant way by granting the rights of Roman citizenship to the people of Gades in Spain¹ in 49 B.C., and by planting Roman colonies at Carthage and Corinth after his return from Munda. By these measures the policy of founding Roman colonies in the provinces was firmly established, and through Caesar's efforts and those of the Second Triumvirate between forty and fifty such settlements were made in the several provinces.² The accompanying table shows how widely they were scattered through the Empire:

| | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Sicily..... | 1 |
| Sardinia..... | 1 |
| Baetica..... | 6 |
| Tarraconensis..... | 5 |
| Gallia Narbonensis..... | 5 |
| Tres Galliae..... | 3 |
| Pannonia..... | 1 |
| Dalmatia..... | 4 |
| Macedonia..... | 1 |
| Achaea and Epirus..... | 4 |
| Asia..... | 1 |
| Bithynia and Pontus..... | 3 |
| Galatia..... | 1 |
| Syria..... | 1 |
| Egypt..... | 1 |
| Africa..... | 6 (or 11) ³ |
| Total..... | 44 (or 49) |

Diverse motives probably led Caesar and the Triumvirs to found these colonies outside of Italy. It is estimated that Caesar's *lex de coloniis deducendis* of 44 B.C., when supplemented by the *lex Antonia*, provided land not only for all of Caesar's veterans but also for eighty thousand needy citizens,⁴ and after the battle of Philippi, Octavian had to provide for one hundred and seventy thousand discharged soldiers.⁵ Room could not be had for all these men in Italy. It was necessary to settle many of them in the provinces, so

¹ Cf. Lange, *Röm. Alt.*, III², 421.

² Cf. Kornemann, *op. cit.*, coll. 526-33.

³ *Ibid.*, col. 533.

⁴ Lange, *Röm. Alt.*, III², 473.

⁵ Heitland, *The Roman Republic*, III, 426.

that this step toward the Romanization of the Empire the government was in a measure forced to take. We should probably be doing Caesar an injustice, however, if we failed to give him credit for a sincere desire to develop and Romanize the provinces and for a definite plan to accomplish this object. He had already shown a sympathy for the provincials and an intelligent interest in their welfare. To put it in another way, he seems to have taken into account the interests of the whole Empire, and not of Rome only, in his colonizing plans. This fact seems to be brought out clearly in his efforts to revive the old centers of trade and commerce at Capua, Corinth, Carthage, and elsewhere, and to establish new ones at such favorable points as Lugudunum. The subsequent history of these cities indicates the wisdom which Caesar showed in his choice of sites. Capua grew to such an extent that it is ranked as the eighth city by Ausonius in his *ordo nobilium urbium*.¹ Corinth was large and flourishing in the time of St. Paul, and its public buildings are mentioned by Pausanias. Carthage became prosperous, and Lugudunum² and Arelate² grew to be important administrative and trading centers. These places and many of the other colonies founded by Caesar, or in pursuance of his plans, served well his purpose of building up trade, of improving the condition of the provinces, and of knitting together the different parts of the Empire.

A glance at the table of provincial colonies shows that more than half of them were planted in the west, and therefore not in the countries with a highly developed civilization. Out of the forty-four established, Spain receives eleven, Gaul eight, Dalmatia four, and Africa six.

From the earliest times when a colony was sent out from Rome the popular assembly adopted a charter for its government, and this charter was conferred on the colony by a duly qualified magistrate. Caesar introduced uniformity into these charters by drawing up in 45 B.C. the *lex Iulia municipalis* to serve as a model for such constitutions in the future.

Even in the brief analysis which has been made here of the colonizing policy of the Romans during the period of the Revolution the

¹ Cf. Pauly-Wissowa, *Realenc.*, III, col. 1559.

² Cf. Bloch in Lavisso, *Histoire de France*, I, 352 f.; *ibid.*, p. 338.

political and social movements of the time stand out clearly, as was remarked at the beginning. The growing influence of the commercial classes is shown in the foundations projected by Gaius Gracchus at Tarentum, Capua, and Carthage, and in the successful commercial centers established by Caesar at many points in the Empire. The Democratic movement is of course reflected in the plans of the Gracchi, in the enrolment of the *capite censi* as colonists, and the purchase of land for them by Marius, and in the equalization of the rights of colonists by the *lex Iulia municipalis*. The appearance of the professional soldier and the influence of the army in politics are shown by the anxious provisions made for the settlement of veterans in colonies by Marius, Sulla, Caesar, and the Triumvirs.

The tendency toward autocratic government is proved nowhere more clearly than in the fact that the colonies of Sulla and the Triumvirs, and most of those founded by Caesar, were not established by a special measure of the popular assembly passed for each colony, as had been the case earlier, but rather by virtue of the general powers vested in one man. Of all the changes in Republican policy which came in during this period none is more significant than the tendency to obliterate the line of distinction which separated the provinces from Italy. This movement begins as early as the third century B.C. with the establishment of Roman colonies in Cisalpine Gaul. Then come the unsuccessful attempt of Gaius Gracchus to establish a colony at Carthage, the founding of Narbo, the granting of Latin rights to towns in Transpadane Gaul in 89 B.C., and the rights of Roman citizenship to them in 49 B.C., and finally the successful establishment of colonies in sixteen different provinces.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

THE FOUR SENATES OF THE BOEOTIANS

BY ROBERT J. BONNER

In 421-420 B.C. a treaty which the Boeotarchs had negotiated with the Corinthians was communicated to a body which Thucydides variously describes as "the four senates of the Boeotians," "the senators of the Boeotians," and "the senate."¹ The plain implication of Thucydides' words is that he had in mind a quadripartite federal body. The available information regarding the Boeotian League was both scanty and uncertain until the discovery of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* in 1908, with its brief but admirable account of the constitution of the league. The constitutions of the ten federated cities were uniform. The franchise was limited and the government was administered by four senates, each of which in turn acted as a committee and formulated measures for final action by a joint meeting of the four sections. The federal constitution provided for eleven Boeotarchs and a senate of 660, a court, and an army. P² does not say that the federal senate was quadripartite as were the local senates. On the basis of his silence the editors concluded that Thucydides was wrong in supposing that the Boeotarchs consulted the federal senators. This necessitated the further conclusion that the local senates controlled the foreign relations of the federation.

Serious objections were at once urged against this view. The practice of delegating to local bodies duties involving the main interests of a league is without parallel in Greek federations.³ It involved a cumbersome and tedious procedure. The Boeotarchs would be under the necessity of visiting ten cities and consulting two bodies in each. There are no data for determining how an issue was settled in case of disagreement among the senates, for the Corinthian treaty was unanimously rejected. Under the circumstances narrated by Thucydides a unanimous acceptance would not

¹ V. 38.

² P is used by the editors to designate the author of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*.

³ The only modern parallel cited is that of the Netherlands (Meyer, *Theopompus Hellenica*, p. 93).

have been strange; but a unanimous rejection by ten different bodies excites the gravest suspicions. It is useless to speculate whether a treaty required the support of all or only a majority of the senates. In any event it is impossible to understand how Thebes could win and maintain a dominant position if she had no more voice in the foreign affairs of the league than small cities like Haliartus and Coronea which were directly represented in the executive council only once in three years while Thebes was represented by four Boeotarchs every year.¹ The objectors also inquired what were the duties of the federal senate of 660 if it had no voice in foreign affairs. Under the more complicated relations of modern life many duties other than those involving the conduct of foreign affairs are assigned to federal bodies; but few of these would be required in an ancient agricultural community.²

The silence of P regarding the treaty-making powers of the local senates is quite as significant as his silence regarding the fourfold division of the federal senate. How could he have failed to record so striking a feature of the system he has described in such considerable detail? And yet, he not only fails to notice this feature but even uses language that seems to exclude the possibility of the intervention of the local senates in federal matters. A clear distinction is made between the local and the federal machinery. The account of the local senates is concluded with the words *καὶ τὰ μὲν ἴδια διετέλουν οὕτω διοικούμενοι*. Then begins the description of the federal constitution. Thus the functions of the local senates are described as *ἴδια*, a word which cannot describe the foreign relations of the entire league. And so according to P the local senates could have had no part in *τὸ τῶν Βοιωτῶν συντεταγμένον*.³

¹ Additional evidence of the ascendancy of Thebes and the means by which it controlled the federal senate is furnished by P. The faction that was in control of the local Theban senate always succeeded with the aid of citizens of other states in controlling the federal senate (*H.O.* xii).

² These arguments were set forth in detail by Dr. Goligher, *Class. Rev.*, XXII (1908), 81 ff. Glotz, *Bull. de corresp. hellénique* XXXII (1908), 272 ff., independently urged the same arguments. Meyer, *Theopomps Hellenica* (1909), reiterated the view of the editors apparently without being aware of the contributions of Goligher and of Glotz. It was not until the appearance of Walker's *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* in 1913 that the view of the editors was defended against these criticisms. Mr. Walker rejects the arguments which I have outlined. The importance of the problem, involving as it does the credibility of Thucydides, is sufficient to justify a restatement of the case with special emphasis on the arguments suggested by Mr. Walker's discussion.

³ *H.O.* xi. Cf. Glotz, *op. cit.*, and Bussman, *Die böotische Verfassung*, p. 27.

It is true that P does not say that the federal senate was quadripartite. But the omission is not significant. In fact I venture to believe that even if Thucydides had said nothing about the "four senates of the Boeotians" modern investigators would eventually have reached the conclusion that the federal senate was organized exactly like the local senates. The purpose of the four-senate system was to facilitate the transaction of business by providing for the discussion and preparation of measures by a smaller body. The federal senate numbered 660. This number in all probability exceeded that of several of the senates in the smaller cities. Consequently the need of some sort of organization for facilitating the transaction of business in the federal senate was quite as desirable as in the city senates.¹ Now the four-senate system either existed originally in all the federated states or was prescribed for them by the federal compact.² In either case it would naturally be employed in the organization of the federal body. The Boeotian *πόλις*, according to P, was governed by a quadripartite senate made up of men with a certain property qualification. No one, I believe, has concluded from P's silence regarding the federal franchise that it was not the same as the local. Why should more importance be attached to his silence regarding the organization of the federal senate?

Further confirmation of the view that the federal senate dealt with the foreign relations of the league is found in P's sketch of party struggles. The party of Astias was pro-Spartan and that of Ismenias was pro-Athenian. In 394 and for some time previously Ismenias is said to have been in control: *καὶ παρ' αὐτοῖς τοῖς Θηβαίοις καὶ παρὰ τῇ βουλῇ τῶν Βοιωτῶν*.³ Nothing is said about the local senates outside of Thebes. The issues that divided the parties are nowhere specified, though it is clear that they must have embraced the foreign policy of the federation. Certainly no party could be in the ascendent that did not determine the foreign policy. And if questions of foreign policy were settled in the local senates it is surprising

¹ Cf. the organization of the Athenian senate.

² The adoption of this system by Chaeronea when it became a sovereign city in 424 is significant. Cf. Bonner, "The Boeotian Federal Constitution," *Classical Philology* (1910), p. 414.

³ *H.O.* xii.

that the federal rather than the city senates should have been the fighting-ground for parties fundamentally interested in questions of foreign policy. On the other hand, the situation described by P is entirely natural if the federal senate exercised the regular functions of a federal body. The failure of P to mention the local senates in connection with his account of the party struggles of the Boeotians is in itself sufficient to show that their functions were purely local.

But even if these important considerations are disregarded, the case against the editors' view is still convincing. For, after all, the question resolves itself into a choice between a *statement* of Thucydides and the *silence* of P. There would seem to be but one answer to this question; but it is precisely at this point that Mr. Walker takes up the argument and gives a new turn to the discussion by facing this issue squarely as follows: "We are called upon to choose between the authority of an *obiter dictum*, an incidental remark, of Thucydides, and the authority of a detailed account of P. We have no reason to suppose that Thucydides had any special interest in, or special knowledge of, the Boeotian constitution: we have every reason to suppose that P had both."¹ It does not improve the situation so far as the reliability of Thucydides is concerned to treat a statement regarding Boeotia as "an incidental remark." Thucydides had abundant reasons and opportunities for acquainting himself with the political situation in Boeotia. The war began with a Theban attack on Plataea, aided and abetted by sympathizers among the Plataeans. Athenians subsequently helped to defend the city when it was besieged. In the trial before the Spartan judges the speeches put into the mouths of the Thebans and the Plataeans furnish some valuable information regarding the political history of Boeotia. It is highly improbable that Thucydides undertook to compose them without knowing the leading features of the

¹ *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, 1913, p. 140. The editors sought to lessen the weight of the indictment of Thucydides' authority by characterizing his statement as "somewhat misleading." Gelzer, *Wochenschrift für klass. Philol.* (1914), p. 127, thinks that Thucydides misunderstood his informant: "Wie mir scheint, ergibt sich aus den Worten des Thucydides, dass sein Gewährsmann die städtischen *βουλαί* meinte: die Boeotarchen *παρήνουν γενέσθαι ὅρκους ταῖς πόλεσιν ὅσαι βούλονται ἐπ' ὥφελιά σφίσι ἐννομῆναι*. Also in jeder einzelnen Stadt befanden die *τίσσαις βουλαί* darüber, ob man sich mit Argos verbünden wolle." Gelzer's view rests on the assumption that Thucydides' only source of information regarding the powers of the Boeotian senates was the account of the negotiations connected with the Corinthian treaty. For this reason alone it is untenable.

federal constitution which had been in force for twenty years. Even if Thucydides never visited Boeotia during his exile, he had ample opportunities for acquiring information about Boeotian affairs from the numerous Plataean refugees resident in Athens.

There is another aspect of the question that is of immediate interest. Athens controlled Boeotia from 457 to 447. On the withdrawal of the Athenians as a result of the battle of Coronea the federal constitution was instituted. It was a constant source of dissatisfaction to considerable numbers of the inhabitants; and Athens continued to cherish hopes of regaining her former ascendancy by intervening in the interest of these discontented factions. It was not until 424 that a serious attempt was made to realize these hopes. Thucydides was one of the generals that year. It is true that he did not participate in the Boeotian campaign, but it is hard to believe that he or any Athenian general should not know the most striking features of the constitution of a state in which Athens intervened with the assistance of political malcontents. Furthermore, it is altogether unlikely that Thucydides,¹ after correcting a current error regarding an unimportant point in Spartan constitutional practice, should himself betray ignorance about a fundamental feature of the constitution of a contiguous state in whose politics Athens was so deeply interested.

Mr. Walker's reference to "the authority of the detailed account of P" is quite irrelevant, for the case rests not on what P says but on what he does not say. And, as is to be expected in an account limited to 33 lines of Oxford text, there are many omissions of what seem to us to be important details. No Greek federation so far as we know ever subordinated the chief federal body to the local governments; and in view of the evidence of Thucydides and the implications of P's account an *argumentum ex silentio* does not afford a sufficient basis for accepting, in the case of Boeotia, a departure in this regard from the regular practice.²

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ i. 20. 3

² If, as seems likely, the local senates included all citizens, a reference to them would amount to a referendum to the entire citizen body. This could be more easily carried out by means of a general popular assembly rather than by means of a series of local assemblies. There is no trace of a Boeotian popular assembly.

MEN'S NAMES IN THE WRITINGS OF CICERO

BY HAROLD L. AXTELL

In a paper published together with others in honor of Professor Gildersleeve some years ago¹ Professor Pease ably discussed different forms of the names of Romans as they appear in the greetings of Cicero's letters. In the following pages I have essayed a similar task in examining the personal names which occur in the texts of these letters as well as in the other works of Cicero. They are found so frequently and so variously that a bewildering impression of chaotic confusion in Roman nomenclature is produced in the mind of the casual and rapid reader. This confusion, moreover, seems far greater here than in the greetings, since the latter are expressed in set forms and their range of signification is more limited, as the correspondents write *to* others only, whereas in the text they write both *to* and *about* others. Nevertheless, the lack of uniformity and consistency is more apparent than real, for in the great majority of instances the reason or reasons for the given form of the name may be found in the context. Indeed, the functions of a man's name, whether it is written in part or in full, are not very numerous, although in a given case it may be difficult to decide which is the principal function. Let us see what these are, taking up first the name in its triple form.

I. PRAENOMEN-NOMEN-COGNOMEN²

The chief purposes of this form are (1) to identify the person named with sufficient completeness, and (2) to add honor or dignity officially³ or formally. Of the former I will cite but one illustration out of many. Certain candidates for office and their supporters are named in a letter to Atticus,⁴ of whom all but two, being well-known

¹ *Studies in Honor of Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve*, Baltimore, 1902, pp. 395 ff.

² It is unnecessary to discuss in this connection the indication of ancestry and of the *tribus*, as these do not occur with the triple name in Cicero except in the greetings and official records, although with two names they are occasionally found.

³ E.g., in a motion made by Cicero, *Philipp.* xi. 30 (my citations are to sections, not to chapters): . . . *Q. Marcio Crispo pro consule, L. Statio Murco pro consule.*

⁴ *Ad Att.* iv. 16. 8.

men, are indicated by a single name. The other two are Lucius Caesar, who is given the praenomen to distinguish him from his more famous relative, and Quintus Pompeius Rufus, whose praenomen distinguishes him probably from others of the same family; the nomen is essential since the cognomen was attached to several *gentes*; and the cognomen distinguishes him from the other branches of the Pompeii. The same man is called Q. Pompeius in a letter to Quintus Cicero who very likely knew him better than Atticus.¹

More often, however, the function of identification is merged with, and subordinate to, that of the expression of dignity, for which purpose Cicero employs it in very complimentary² allusions in the essays³ and orations,⁴ and in recommendations and introductions in his correspondence.⁵ The praenomen-nomen occurs often in these epistles, to be sure, but in these cases it is almost always the complete name, the cognomen being lacking. Only three or four instances show the praenomen-cognomen, and in these the men referred to were already widely known by reputation or by family connections. The nomen is found by itself alone only three times, in two of which the context shows that the man introduced was well acquainted with the one addressed.

One group of epistles⁶ nicely illustrates the degrees of formality varying between the first introduction and subsequent recommendations of one already known. In a formal note L. Egnatius Rufus is introduced; in a subsequent note to the same person he is called L. Egnatius, which is the same name he bears in a third letter

¹ The full name Q. Caecilius Bassus (*Fam.* xii. 11. 1) avoids confusion with the Caecilii Metelli and the Ventidii Bassi; L. Sestius Pansa with another Sestius and other Pansas (*Quint. fr.* ii. 11. 3); T. Ampius Balbus (*Fam.* xiii. 70. 1) with T. Ampius Menander.

² W. Schulze, *Zur Gesch. der lat. Eigennamen*, p. 488, says the triple name had more official importance even in good company. This is scarcely true for Cicero, as he seems to admit (p. 492). The three names are fairly common for very polite and honorable reference, where official designation is not necessary (see *Verr.* i. 127).

³ It is especially frequent in the list of orators in the *Brutus*.

⁴ Note how the orator's admiration for Pompey and his indignation at the dishonor done to his name by Antony is emphasized in *Philipp.* ii. 64: *bona Cn. Pompeii, . . . bona, inquam, Cn. Pompeii Magni*. . . . Again, he proudly honors himself and slurs the Gracchan follower Flaccus in *De domo* 102: *ut domus M. Tullii Ciceronis cum domo Fulvii Placii coniuncta esse videatur*.

⁵ *Fam.* xiii. 13; xiii. 53; xiii. 29.

⁶ E.g., *ibid.* xiii. 43, 44, 45, 47.

addressed to one who seems to know him well; finally, the briefest name, Egnatius, Cicero uses when he praises him to one who is an intimate of Egnatius.

Many of these names belong to freedmen, foreigners, or adopted sons,¹ in which cases they not only show honor but reveal the former slave-name, the Roman patron, or former family.

The triple name is also used in humor and sarcasm. The latter is neatly expressed in Caelius' lines² which we may render: "This is to inform you that Gaius Sempronius Rufus, your delight and darling, has won—a conviction for calumny with everyone's approval." The sudden change from a formal announcement to a surprising jest is quite effective. Mock formality and solemnity are the objects of Cicero's announcement to Atticus.³ "Be it known to you that in the consulship of Lucius Julius Caesar and Gaius Marcius Figulus I have been blest with a son."⁴ As will be seen later, the names of consuls in dates have usually the double form, sometimes even one name.

II. THE PRAENOMEN-NOMEN

This very common double name serves in the first place as a full name for those men who did not possess the cognomen, for whom it was used on quite formal occasions as well as when it was necessary merely to avoid confusion with other persons. The identification was

¹ E.g., *ibid.* xiii. 69: C. Curtius Mithres; xiii. 70: T. Ampius Menander; xiii. 23. 1: L. Cossinius Anchialus; xiii. 35. 1: C. Avianius Philoxenus; iii. 4: Q. Fabius Vergilianus; xiii. 76. 2: C. Valgius Hippianus; xiii. 21. 1: M. Aemilius Avianianus.

² *Ibid.* viii. 8. 1.

³ *Att.* i. 2. 1.

⁴ One or two peculiar cases of the triple name occur in the greetings. As Professor Pease pointed out (*op. cit.*, p. 401) its usual tone is business-like, formal, or official. But the greeting: *C. Asinius Pollio Cicero* *s.d.* (*Fam.* x. 31 and 32) rather startles us. It would resemble the modern superscription "Dear Bryan" and the signature, "I am very truly yours, Thomas Nelson Page." In a subsequent letter the greeting reads: *Pollio Cicero* *s.p.* (*Fam.* x. 33), but this is, if anything, a less friendly epistle than the preceding. Is it possible (if indeed the text is correct) that Pollio felt Cicero was known to all the world by the cognomen alone, while he himself needed the full name for dignity? Several greetings run as follows: *Cicero s.d. L. Papirio Paeto* (*Fam.* ix. 18); *Cicero s.d. M. Fadio Gallo* (*ibid.* vii. 27); *Cicero Sextilio Rufo quaest. s.d.* (*ibid.* viii. 48). The letter to Gallus is unfriendly, but Cicero is frigidly polite in using Gallus' full name, although he deems it unnecessary thus to dignify himself. Rufus was addressed in his official capacity while Cicero was not in office and possibly did not wish to be too formal with his own name.

aided, and the formality increased, by the addition of the designation of ancestry or of the *tribus*, or of an office or title, but these additions are not very frequent.¹

In the second place the praenomen-nomen often suffices to point out a man for whom a single name would be uncertain. This, indeed, is the informal way of mentioning anyone for the first time. Thus the brothers of Cassius, the "liberator," are given the praenomen, while he bears the nomen alone; so, too, L. Domitius is distinguished from Gnaeus.

It is, in the third place, a means of polite or honorary reference. Thus, in one letter Cicero uses the full name T. Ampius Balbus in order to distinguish him from his freedman, T. Ampius Menander, but in semi-formal epistles he calls him T. Ampius.² This usage applies to all classes, high and low, prominent and obscure. The obscure, indeed, were dignified by the designation, which corresponds closely in feeling to our title, "Mr."

The cognomen alone is the name which Milo almost invariably bears in the letters supporting him for the consulship, but in one eulogistic and emphatic sentence Cicero calls him T. Annius. Again, in the *Pro Milone* the orator alternates between the dignified form T. Annius and the informal Milo, while in the emotional references toward the end he names him T. Annius and represents himself addressed by Milo as *M. Tulli*.³ Likewise, the name of a man so well known publicly as to be spoken of by the nomen alone is emphasized by the addition of the praenomen, e.g.: *Cn. Pompeius, princeps in re publica*,⁴ . . . *familiaris noster, Q. Hortensius*.⁵ Atticus was recommended as *T. Pomponius* and again, *T. Pomponius, necessarius meus*.⁶

¹ The sign of descent occurs most often in the essays, usually to identify, at times to honor, e.g., *De Fin.* ii. 58; *Brut.* 72, 99, 100, 177, 180, 175, 240, 247. In the letters it occurs but twice for honor (*Fam.* xiii. 9. 2; xiii. 11. 1), once ironically (*Att.* xii. 49. 1; possibly also i. 12. 3). In view of the frequent mention of the *tribus* in inscriptions it is surprising to find no instance in the greetings of the letters and only two in the texts. Both descent and tribe are indicated twice in the orations, once for honor (*Pro Quintio* 24; *Verr.* ii. 107).

² *Fam.* xiii. 70; i. 3. 2; ii. 16. 3; *Att.* viii. 11b. 2.

³ § 94. Cf. Schulze, *op. cit.*, p. 492, n. 2. Tullius, not Cicero, is the semi-polite name used by Caecilius (*In Caecil.*, § 51).

⁴ *Fam.* i. 9. 11; see also v. 2. 6; iii. 10. 10.

⁵ *Ibid.* ii. 16. 3.

⁶ *Ibid.* v. 5. 1; v. 4. 1.

The praenomen-nomen is the form by which Cicero's essays are dedicated to his friends. It is the style of respectful reference used in the orations¹ and it is the regular way in which the orator addressed the officer presiding at a trial. In the essays the names of historical characters are very commonly found in this form,² which, of course, is not so emphatic as the triple name. It is the courteous and official name of Cicero himself. As noted above, he represents Milo's name for him as *M. Tulli*. This also appears to be his name in the proceedings of the Senate, for he quotes³ the supposed words of senators who were likely to ask him which side he intended to take in the Civil War as *Dic, M. Tulli*. He then asks if he shall reply, *Exspecta, amabo te, dum Atticum conveniam*, using his friend's cognomen in this colloquial sentence in order to emphasize the ridiculous feebleness of the reply. In a subsequent letter⁴ he proposes to say *Cn. Pompeio assentior*, adding to this elsewhere, *id est, T. Pomponio*.⁵ The latter name was doubtless used of Atticus in the Senate. When Cicero employs it in a despairing prayer⁶ that his dear friend would bury him he produces the effect of sacred solemnity.

On the other hand, this double name lends emphasis in a derogatory manner. Caelius writes,⁷ for example, "Have you ever seen a more incapable man than your Gnaeus Pompey?" and Cicero himself shows his disgust with his leader's activity more than once in the same way.⁸ He also calls his bitter enemy P. Clodius even where his purpose is not clearness. In the famous description of the Clodian trial he says⁹ the jurors exposed their throats in his defense to P. Clodius, that is, "the influential, dangerous, notorious

¹ It is his habit to speak of a person quite dignifiedly at first; later to drop the praenomen gradually, e.g., L. Catilinam, *Cat.* ii. 1. 3, but Catilina §§ 6, 7, and *passim*; C. Rabirius, *Pro Rabirio* § 1, but Postumus a few lines below; Q. Caecili, *In Caecil.*, first seven chapters, but Caecilius, *infra*.

² A good illustration is *De orat.* ii. 40: *dixit enim Q. Lutatius*. Catulus is always the appellation when a single name is used for this man. Cf. *ibid.* i. 37: Q. Pompeius (Rufus); i. 40: P. Rutilius; *Acad.* i. 8: L. Aelius (Stilo); *De orat.* i. 37: L. Furius Philo; *Brut.* 115: Q. Mucius (Scaevola); and others.

³ *Att.* vii. 1. 4.

⁴ *Ibid.* vii. 3. 5.

⁵ *Ibid.* vii. 7. 7.

⁶ *Ibid.* iii. 19. 3. Tyrrell, however, rejects *T.* and reads *mi* both here and in *Att.* iv. 2. 5.

⁷ *Fam.* viii. 15. 1.

⁸ E.g., *Att.* ix. 12. 3; ix. 19. 2; x. 3a. 2; cf. Appius Claudius, *ibid.* viii. 1. 3.

⁹ *Ibid.* i. 16. 4.

Clodius." Similarly with Antony: *Perditissimi hominis et turpissimi M. Antoni*.¹ In fact the praenomen with the nomen or cognomen is quite generally equivalent to the pronoun *ille* or *iste*.

III. PRAENOMEN-COGNOMEN

This combination serves much the same purposes as the praenomen-nomen, and is used as a convenient means of reference to those men whose cognomina were in more general use than their nomina. In this way Lucius Caesar is always distinguished from the dictator, Decimus Brutus from the more famous Brutus.² Sometimes a second cognomen or the indication of parentage is necessary for clearness.³

The praenomen-cognomen also shows dignity and honor.⁴ While Caesar is repeatedly mentioned by the last name only, a dozen cases of the appellation C. Caesar occur in the epistles and only two were intended for clearness.⁵ The others are polite or honorary in tone. One of them, indeed, in which Pollio says the bold young Balbus boasted of doing the same feats as C. Caesar seems eulogistic.⁶ In like fashion Antony flatteringly writes to Cicero, "Caesar counts M. Cicero especially among his friends."⁷ The very common custom of naming historical characters and of naming eponymous consuls with the praenomen-nomen or praenomen-cognomen, which appears so frequently, especially in the essays and orations, seems intended for the same purpose.

Yet these two double forms of the personal name are not always equivalent in function, although it is a difficult task in many cases to discover or express the shades of difference.⁸ We know, however, that the cognomen is more honorable than the nomen, and if we examine the appellations M. Tullius and M. Cicero, which are both given to the orator, we may lay down for this case, and probably

¹ *Brut.* ii. 7. 2; cf. *Fam.* x. 13. 2 and elsewhere.

² *Att.* iv. 16. 8; *Fam.* viii. 7. 2; cf. the list of *consulares* in *Att.* xii. 21. 1.

³ *Att.* i. 19. 2; *iv.* 16. 9; *Quint. fr.* ii. 3. 5; *Fam.* ix. 7. 1.

⁴ E.g., *Fam.* i. 9. 16: *M. illum Scaurum, singularem virum*.

⁵ These too (*Att.* i. 12. 3; *iv.* 14. 2) are not necessarily for clearness.

⁶ *Fam.* x. 32. 2; cf. the vocative *C. Caesar* frequent in *Pro Marcello*.

⁷ *Att.* x. 8a. 1.

⁸ *P. Mucii* and *P. Scaevolam* seem indifferent in *Brut.* 98.

for many others, this general distinction: the praenomen-nomen is employed in the family, and in legal and official connections, as in the Senate and courts.¹ It is respectful and polite, but not so cordial, admiring, even flattering, as the praenomen-cognomen.² Cicero's name to his family, to very close family friends, on the Senate-roll, and before the law was M. Tullius; to his enthusiastic and loyal supporters in public life it was M. Cicero.

Again, the distinction between M. Varro and M. Terentius, two names for the same man which occur within a few lines of each other in a letter of recommendation,³ may be similarly explained. Cicero uses the first form, perhaps, to honor Varro, showing his connection with the learned Varro and separating him from the less noble branches of the Terentii, such as the Culleos, Vespas, and those others who lacked cognomina. After this high honor is paid his friend he refers to him as M. Terentius, the designation Varro's own family would probably use, thus making himself a relative of Varro, as it were. At the close of the letter, laying aside all formality he calls him by his usual public name, Varro. In a letter to Atticus, M. Varro is the name found.

IV. NOMEN-COGNOMEN AND COGNOMEN-NOMEN

It is the prevailing, if not the almost universal, view that the order, cognomen-nomen, was Cicero's usage when the praenomen was omitted before the rest of the name. Tyrrell, for example, says: "When the praenomen is left out (which was universal in conversation and customary in writing after Caesar's time) it appears that Cicero almost always, both in his speeches as well as in his letters, puts the cognomen before the nomen."⁴ This widespread view apparently goes back to Professor Lahmeyer, who said: "In the earlier Roman period this [i.e., the use of the nomen-cognomen]

¹ *Verr.* iv. 79; *De domo* 44, 47, and 50; *Cat.* i. 27; *Pro Mil.* 94; *Att.* vii. 1. 4; vii. 3. 5; *Pro Tull.* 29; cf. the nomen alone: *In Caec.* 51; *Pro Sest.* 123; but see also *In Pis.* 72.

² *Att.* x. 8a. 1; xiv. 1. 2. The element of praise may explain the name M. Cicero which he employs for himself in *Pro Ligario* 6; also before the senators in *Philipp.* vii. 8. He represents himself addressed as Cicero in the essays, e.g., *De fin.* v. 6; *Top.* 51.

³ *Fam.* xiii. 10. 1, 2; cf. Schulze, *op. cit.*, p. 492, n. 2.

⁴ *The Correspondence of Cicero*, III, 47, note; cf. Egbert, *Livy, Book xxi and Selections*, note on xxi. 11. 1.

was not the case. The shorter designation by nomen-cognomen might have been employed; but the method of expression which was almost invariable in Cicero and common in the other writers of that and the succeeding period shows plainly that in the earlier period when one wanted to use that shorter designation for a Roman citizen, then regularly the cognomen entered into the place of the omitted praenomen, as it were, and departing from the usual order took its place before the nomen."¹

But Lahmeyer's statistics were inaccurate in my opinion and his reasoning unsound. For, in the first place, he cites thirty-five examples of the nomen-cognomen employed by Cicero and thirty-five of the reverse order.² Ten others of the latter he finds in the letters of Cicero's friends. But if my count be correct, there are forty-six possible cases of the normal order written by Cicero and four by his correspondents, while there are sixty-six cases in all of the reverse order, ten of which are by the hands of correspondents.³

Of his thirty-five examples of the nomen-cognomen from Cicero's hand Lahmeyer strikes out eighteen, arguing that they were applied to freedmen or to Romans of low standing and that the orator did not care to mention their names in the usual dignified way.⁴ Yet of the sixteen different individuals named in these eighteen examples, three were certainly genuine Romans in honorable callings;⁵ of three

¹ *Philologus*, XXII (1865), 469 ff. (translated). Schulze, *op. cit.*, seems to hold (p. 491), not that Cicero always inverted the order, but that he often did so.

² Lahmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 484.

³ Some of these are disputed and uncertain. As the abbreviation of the praenomen could easily have dropped out from the text, it is impossible to be certain of the original reading. Yet there are twice as many doubtful cognomina-nomina as nomina-cognomina, and in any case all of them together are too few to affect the argument. I have used Wessenberg's, and Tyrrell and Purser's editions of the *Epistulae*, Wilkins' *De Oratore*, Reid's *Academica*, Hutchinson's *De Finibus*, and Klotz's general edition for the other essays and the orations. I append the uncertain cases: *Acad. pr. ii. 11*: Tetrilius Rogus; *Fam. ix. 16*: Papirio Paeto; *Fam. viii. 13. 2*: Pompeius Magnus; see Tyrrell, *ad loc.*; *Fam. xiii. 43*: Quintio Gallo; *Att. vi. 1. 25*: see Tyrrell, *ad loc.*, Magnus Pompeius; *Ad Brut. ii. 5. 3*: Celer Pilius is Ruete's emendation generally accepted; *Philipp. xi. 13*: Appulus may be Apulus, a proper adjective; *ibid. xiii. 26*: Philadelphus may be a nickname only; *De orat. i. 283*: Phrygionis; Wilkins thinks this is a common noun; *Att. vi. 1. 23*: Sidicinus may be an adjective; *Quint. fr. iii. 8. 5*: one manuscript has Mestitii, others Domestici; *Philipp. xiii. 27*: Decius is suspicious.

⁴ Lahmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 493.

⁵ Caecilius Bassus (*Fam. xii. 18. 1*) was quaestor and commander of a legion; Tetrilius Rogus (*Acad. ii. 4. 11*) is called *doctus* and was a friend of Lucullus; Helvius Mancia (*De orat. ii. 266*) was an orator.

others absolutely nothing derogatory is stated or known.¹ This leaves two *libertini*, and eight others of evident disrepute.

Again, seven other *cognomina* are excluded by this theory² on the ground that they are not genuine or permanent parts of the family name (*cognomina fixa*, *cognomina stirpis*), but are attached for the time being (*cognomina adiuncta*). Yet at least three, even if they did spring up first as *adiuncta*, of these names,³ are used elsewhere in Cicero as real names and not merely as adjectival or appositive designations. The others bear the suffix *-anus* showing the *gens* they belonged to before adoption, and the fact that Octavianus and other names of similar formation⁴ are found alone and independent shows that *cognomina* of this kind were real and essential members of the full name and not descriptive adjectives or appositives.

There remain, then, only seven examples of the nomen-cognomen for genuine Romans of good family and standing in Lahmeyer's list, and for these he resorted to the desperate remedy of emending by inserting the praenomen. But he overlooked eight other cases, which bring the number to fifteen,⁵ almost one-third of the total number of instances of this usage. Besides these, four others are found in letters of Pollio, Cassius, and Caelius.⁶

Instead, therefore, of but seven of these appellations for real Romans out of a total of thirty-five, we find twenty-six, possibly twenty-nine, out of forty-six.

In his discussion of the cognomen-nomen, moreover, Professor Lahmeyer asserted that with respect to freedmen, provincials, or

¹ Tettius Damio (*Att.* iv. 3. 3); Annius Saturninus (*ibid.* v. 1. 2); Safinius Atella (*Pro Cluent.* 68).

² Lahmeyer, p. 478.

³ Tarquinius Superbus, *Lael.* 28; cf. Superbus alone as a proper name in *Paradoxa* i. 11; Pomponius Atticus, *Fam.* xiii. 1. 5; Atilius Calatinus, *Cat. Maior* 61 (cf. Calatinos Atilios, *Pro Sest.* 72). Egnatius Maximus, *Att.* xiii. 34, is not mentioned again, but the cognomen is evidently an integral part of the name and not merely descriptive.

⁴ E.g., Precianus, *Fam.* vii. 8. 2; Buclianus, *Att.* xv. 17. 2.

⁵ *Att.* ix. 19. 2: Pontius Titinianus, son of Q. Titinius; xii. 11: Pompeius Magnus; xii. 2. 1: Statius Murcus, a proconsul; *Fam.* ix. 26. 1: Volumnius Eutrapelus, an eque; xiii. 43: Quintius Gallus, a *legatus*; *Pro Sest.* 72: Gavius Ofella, from whose family one was adopted by the Atilii Calatini; *Pro Caec.* 28: Fideculianus Falcula, a senator; *Pro Fundan.* (fragm.) 1: Villius Annalis, a senator.

⁶ *Fam.* x. 33. 4: Pontius Aquila, a *legatus* of D. Brutus and owner of a good villa; xii. 13. 4: Sextilius Rufus, quaestor; xii. 13. 3: Tillius Cimber; viii. 13. 2: Pompeius Magnus.

other citizens, who were formerly aliens and originally had never been subject to the rigid name-order, it was immaterial which order was used, whereas this looseness with the names of true Romans would have been suspicious; that from this class of citizens this carelessness in the order of names spread to native Romans, and if they were spoken of by the nomen-cognomen, the speaker wished to indicate that their civic standing was as low or as inconspicuous as that of freedmen or foreigners.¹ He cited but seven cases of the cognomen-nomen for these men and twenty of the other order, a ratio which would imply that these obscure people were not so often dignified with the strict name-order of the higher classes. But when we add to his seven more than a score of other instances of freedmen, foreigners, and men whose low birth or standing is alluded to,² we see that almost half of the total cases of this supposedly strict Roman order is found with the low class, a much greater number than of the nomen-cognomen. Indeed, it is significant that in the denunciations of Antony's base followers in the *Philippics* the cognomen-nomen is the regular order with one exception.³

More than that, Cicero represents speakers of an earlier period using both orders, even the same speaker using both, e.g., Antonius, in *De Oratore* ii. 266, says *Helvium Manciam*; in 253 he says *Vespa Terentius*; Cato, in *Cato Maior* 61, says *Atilio Calatino*; in 48 *Turpione Naevio*.⁴ Furthermore, although it is true, as Lahmeyer observed, that D. Brutus, Plancus, and M. Brutus employed the

¹ Curschmann, *Zur Inversion der römischen Eigennamen*, I. *Cicero bis Livius* (Giessen dissertation), pp. 24 f., and Schulze, *op. cit.*, p. 491, point out that the custom of omitting the praenomen probably started among these classes, but they do not go so far as to consider the nomen-cognomen less courteous than the other order.

² *Fam.* vii. 14. 1: Chrysippus Vettius; *Att.* xiii. 24: Hermogenes Clodius; *Cat. Maior* 48: Turpio Ambivius; *Verr.* ii. 145: Alba Aemilius; *Philipp.* ii. 8: Mustela Tamisius; xiii. 26: Philadelphus Annius; ii. 8; xii. 14: Tiro Numisius; xi. 13: Appulus Domitius; xiii. 3 and *Att.* xiii. 52: Barba Cassius; *Pro Flac.* 84 and 94: Andro Sextilius; *Post red. in sen.* 13; *De prov. cons.* 7; in *Pis.* 14: Caesoninus Calventius; *Philipp.* xiii. 26: Cotyla Varius; xiii. 27: Saxa Decidius; *Att.* xiii. 14. 1: Sabinus Albius; xii. 5. 2: Bassus Lucilius; *Fam.* xi. 20. 1: Labeo Segulius (cf. *Fam.* xi. 21); *Quint. fr.* ii. 3. 2: Pola Servius; in *Pis.* 24: Taurea Iubellius.

³ *Viz.*, *Philipp.* ii. 56; see ii. 8; xi. 13, and especially xiii. 26 and 27; cf. *Verr.* ii. 117; iii. 145, and see Schulze, *op. cit.*, p. 491.

⁴ See also *Lael.* 28: Tarquinius Superbum (whereas Quintus Cicero says Superbus Tarquinius in *De divin.* i. 43); *De nat. deor.* ii. 61: Atilio Calatino; *Acad.* ii. 11: Tetrilius Rogus (Crepereius Rocus?). On the other hand, *De orat.* 283: Phrygionis Pompeii; *Lael.* 39: Papum Aemilium.

transposition,¹ yet Cassius used the normal order,² and Pollio and Caelius both orders.³ Caesar, as we know, wrote nomen-cognomen in all but one case.⁴ Finally, and most important of all, perhaps, Cicero himself designated the same individual in both ways.⁵

In view of these facts it is far from certainty, and, to my mind, from probability, that any set order was observed by Cicero. Granted that the cognomen was the more honorable, even ennobling, name and that, as Mommsen observed,⁶ it was somewhat akin to the praenomen in function, and consequently the transposed order was possibly more polite than the other, yet both forms, it appears to me, arose from an informal, even negligent, style of appellation, since in almost all the passages in which they are found no attempt to attain dignity or honor can be discovered. The informality may range from the careless, but still affectionate or eulogistic allusion,⁷ to sneering or vituperation.⁸ But the presence of the praenomen with either nomen or cognomen always denoted greater regard for formality or politeness than its absence.

It seems very probable, moreover, that in some cases the writer or speaker started to refer to a man by either his nomen or cognomen, whichever was in more common use, or else was formal or informal according to the speaker's wishes at the moment; then, bethinking himself of possible confusion with another man of the same name, he hastened to add the other name to avoid ambiguity.⁹ This custom acted, doubtless, as an additional influence toward the growth into regular fashion of either name-order in cases of easy-going reference and where the praenomen was not known at the time.

¹ Lahmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 484; *Fam.* xi. 9: Pollione Asinio; xi. 1. 4: Bassum Caecilius; x. 21. 3: Laevo Cispio; *Ad Brut.* i. 11. 1; ii. 3: Vetus Antistius.

² *Fam.* xii. 13. 3, 4: Tillius Cimber and Sextilius Rufus.

³ *Ibid.* x. 33. 4: Pontium Aquilam; x. 32. 5: Gallum Cornelium; viii. 13. 2: Pompeius Magnus; viii. 9. 5; viii. 11. 2: Balbus Cornelius.

⁴ Lahmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 480.

⁵ *Pro Planc.* 60: Atilius Calatinus; *Pro Sest.* 72: Calatinos Atilios.

⁶ *Römische Forschungen*, p. 42; Schulze, *op. cit.*, p. 502.

⁷ *Fam.* xiii. 1. 5; *Cat. Maior* 61; *Fam.* xiii. 64. 1.

⁸ *De prov. cons.* 7; *Cat. iii.* 6.

⁹ It is rather significant that the fluctuation in order occurs often among those names, of which the nomen and cognomen were used indifferently, when a single appellation was used. E.g., Asinius and Pollio are each found singly; see *Fam.* i. 6. 1; ix. 25. 3; *Att.* xii. 2. 1; xiv. 5. 1.

This hypothesis finds confirmation in the fact that it accounts for a great part of the double names in Cicero's letters. For in this way Egnatius Maximus is kept distinct from Egnatius Rufus and other Egnatii; Fabius Luscus from numerous other Fabii; Domitius Calvinus from the Ahenobarbi and other Domitii; Caecilius Bassus from the other Caecilii and the other Bassi; Gallus Fadius from Gallus Caninius and Gallus Cornelius; Flaccus Volumnius from the Valerii; and so on.¹ We may see this afterthought in actual process in a letter to Atticus. Here Cicero says: *Cornelius—hunc dico Balbum, Caesaris familiaris*. In three other places this man is called Balbus Cornelius.² Compare *Cornelium—is est Artemidorus*. . . ., and also Gavius Firmanus,³ where though Firmanus is rather a designation of residence, the tendency toward an additional designation as an afterthought is plainly shown.

Besides affording additional identification, the second name frequently furnishes other information, the family connection of a freedman, the patron of a naturalized citizen, or similar facts. Thus Eros Turius, freedman of Q. Turius; Pontius Titinianus; Hermogenes Clodius; Trypho Caecilius; Pompeius Vindullus,⁴ and others.

V. NOMEN-NOMEN AND COGNOMEN-COGNOMEN

The occurrence of two nomina or two cognomina, especially of the latter, is not uncommon, the purpose being apparently to avoid ambiguity or to show parentage. The extra cognomen is of the class that Lahmeyer termed *adiunctum* and it sometimes precedes the other cognomen.⁵

We will now take up the single names.

¹ *Att.* xiii. 34; vi. 1. 23; *Fam.* xiii. 43. 1; *Att.* iv. 8b. 3; *Quint. fr.* iii. 4. 1; *Att.* xii. 5. 2; cf. Asinius Dento, *Att.* v. 20. 4, and Asinius Pollio; Labeo Segulius, *Fam.* xi. 20. 1, and several other Labeos; Volumnius Eutrapelus, *Fam.* ix. 26. 1 and the Volumnii Flacci. On the other hand, Ahala ille Servilius and Caesoninus Calventius and many other examples cannot of course be explained on this ground.

² *Att.* ii. 3. 3.

³ *Verr.* ii. 54; *Att.* iv. 8b. 3; see also *Philipp.* ii. 27: *Quid duos Servilios—Cascas dicam an Ahalas?*—a case of ironical ambiguity.

⁴ *Fam.* xii. 26. 2; *Att.* ix. 19. 2; xiii. 24; iii. 8. 3; vi. 1. 23.

⁵ E.g., *Att.* vi. 1. 17: Scipio Metellus; i. 16. 14: Metellus Numidicus; ii. 13. 2; 24. 4: Crassus Dives; *Fam.* viii. 4. 1: Lentulus Crus; xiii. 22. 1: Varro Murena; *Ad Brut.* i. 12. 1: Messalla Corvinus; *Pro Cluent.* 65: Statius Albius; *Pro Corn.* 56: Venonius Vindicius; *Pro Plan.* 54: Plotius Peditus; *Att.* ix. 10: Octavius Mamilius; *Fam.* ix. 22. 2: Piso ille Frugi; *De fin.* ii. 90: Frugi ille Piso; *Fam.* ix. 10. 2: Bursa Plancus.

VI. PRAENOMEN

The praenomen often suffices as a means of reference. Thus in a letter Cicero mentions Brutus and a few lines below Decimus, meaning Decimus Brutus. He often refers to the Clodian brothers as Appius and Publius. Members of the families which almost monopolized certain praenomina are repeatedly named by those names alone, e.g., Appius for Claudius, Servius for Sulpicius.¹

But on the other hand, the praenomen is a good means of concealment from others than the recipient of the letter. This explains many instances of the name Publius (Clodius) in missives which Cicero feared might go astray into unfriendly hands;² also the covert expression, "The son of Aulus."³

Much more commonly, affection and intimacy are thus expressed. For example, Quintus Cicero writing to Tiro calls his brother Marcus and elsewhere addresses him as *mi Marce*.⁴ A striking instance also occurs in the correspondence with Cornificius. Cicero usually addresses him as *mi Cornifici*, but on one occasion after using that vocative, he dares to use the more affectionate *mi Quinte*⁵ when he implores him to join his side in the Civil War. Again, in a passionate cry to Atticus for consolation and advice he writes *mi Tite*, whereas later in the same epistle he says more calmly *mi Attice*. As a vocative, however, the praenomen is generally confined to close relatives. As intimate a friend as Atticus Cicero calls Titus⁶ only four times and two of these instances are in Greek for humorous effect.

¹ *Att.* xv. 10; iv. 2. 3; iii. 17. 1; iv. 3. 5; ii. 22. 4; iv. 15. 9; iv. 11. 2; v. 4. 1; vii. 3. 3; vii. 17. 3; *passim*; see also Schulze, *op. cit.*, p. 487, n. 7 and references there. Cf. also Attus, *Att.* x. 8. 6, for the celebrated Attus Navius.

² *Att.* ii. 7; ii. 8; ii. 9; ii. 12; ii. 15; ii. 22.

³ E.g., *ibid.*, i. 18. 5. I agree with Tyrrell, Watson, and others that the phrase does not express insignificance.

⁴ *Fam.* xvi. 26. 1; xvi. 16. 1. The stereotyped greeting, *M. Quinto fratri*, is open to suspicion. In the texts of the correspondence about one-third of the references to Quintus lack the appositive; where it occurs it is apparently an additional sign of affection.

⁵ *Fam.* xii. 24. 4.

⁶ *O Tite* (*Cat. Maior* 1) shows affection, but is introduced mainly for the sake of the quotation, which is so apposite. *Tite* occurs once in *Brutus* 292, elsewhere in the same work it is *Attice*; cf. Schulze, *loc. cit.* Tyrrell (*op. cit.*, I, 3d ed., p. 57) holds that the use of the praenomen was not a mark of intimacy, but that its omission was, and he cites in support *Fam.* vii. 32. 1: *quod sine praenomine familiariter*. . . . On this authority he strangely interprets *Hor. Sat.* ii. 5. 32 f.: "*Quinte*," *pula, aut*

In cases other than that of direct address the praenomen is more freely used to indicate intimacy. Pompey is sometimes mentioned as Gnaeus, more often as *Gnaeus noster*; Peducaeus as Sextus; Sulpicius Rufus as Servius.¹ Conversing with Caesar, Cicero called Pompey Gnaeus, indicating thereby that he was their mutual friend. This makes it likely that the praenomen was the name by which Caesar, Cicero, and Atticus spoke of Pompey, who, though now an enemy, had been Caesar's son-in-law and close associate. Pompey likewise called Cicero Marcus when he conversed with Quintus.² Slaves sometimes referred to their masters by this part of the name.³

On the other hand, the praenomen is occasionally disparaging, e.g., *Gnaeus autem—O rem miseram et incredibilem—ut totus iacet; non animus est, non consilium, non copiae, non diligentia.*⁴ Cassius writes of the younger Pompey: "You know what a fool Gnaeus is."⁵ *Publius noster* is the loving designation Cicero gives his implacable foe—not for secrecy, for the name Clodius appears in the same letter.⁶ In speeches in which he denounced the opponents of his client he addressed them contemptuously sometimes by using the vocative of their praenomina, whereas the presiding officer and the client were always addressed and referred to by two names.⁷ For

"Publi" *gaudent praenomine molles Auricolae*, to mean that "fastidious Romans wished to be addressed with distant and formal respect." But he overlooked the fact that Cicero and Horace referred to two different situations, the former to the use of the nomen or cognomen in the salutation of a letter without the customary praenomen, the latter to the use of the praenomen in conversation (without thought of a second name) by one who desired to be as intimate or affectionate as possible. The former case showed informal familiarity, the latter intimacy or affection, as Horace's words plainly imply.

¹ *Att.* vii. 16. 2; vii. 20. 1; viii. 4. 2; ix. 1. 2; ix. 7. 2; ix. 13. 6; *passim*.

² *Ibid.* ix. 18. 1; ix. 10. 4; *Fam.* i. 9. 9.

³ *Philipp.* ii. 77: Ianitor: "*Quis tu?*" "*A Marco [i.e., Antonio] tabellarius.*"

⁴ *Att.* vii. 21. 1.

⁵ *Fam.* xv. 19. 4.

⁶ *Att.* ii. 19. 4; cf. iv. 3. 5; iv. 15. 4. It is possible that the praenomen in Lucilius' poem on Albucius (*De fin.* i. 9.) *χαῖρε*, Tite . . . , may have been used by Scaevola as a deliberate slur instead of the fuller, courteous form.

⁷ *Pro Caecina* 102; *Pro Quinct.* 38, 40. Schulze, *loc. cit.*, n. 6, is in doubt about the reason for *Sexte* in this latter citation. But it seems clear that addressing the jurors Cicero employs the praenomen-nomen for emphasis in these sections; addressing Naevius he tries to browbeat him by an insinuatingly familiar use of the first name, a custom which certain modern lawyers have in handling witnesses who have no specially high standing in the community.

instance, in his defense of Murena, the orator diplomatically eulogizes Cato, his client's accuser, but in the same breath that he acknowledges Cato's prestige he playfully belittles his dignity with the slightly familiar *Marce*.¹

The praenomen is an occasional appellation for a boy, young or old, but, strange to say, it is not the usual one. Sittius' son is called *Publius tuus*, and Quintus is the usual, though not invariable, name for Cicero's nephew.² But these are about the only cases in the epistles and it is astonishing that while Cicero, junior, is repeatedly mentioned by his father and others he is never called Marcus. We need only to think of Lincoln's calling his son Lincoln or "my Lincoln" to realize how foreign to us this custom is. It is true that Cicero addresses his son by name but once in the letters and that he dedicates each book of the *De officiis* by the form *Marce fili*, which he also uses three times elsewhere in that work.³ But inasmuch as he writes *mi Cicero* in the affectionate farewell as well as several times elsewhere in the work,⁴ and since the form in the dedication is stereotyped and the appositive *fili* is otiose, we may infer that the latter address is mainly literary, intended chiefly for other readers of the book than his son.

Scions of other families, too, are designated by the nomen or cognomen instead of the praenomen. It seems as if the Romans were so proud of their family names that they thought of their sons as bearers of these rather than as dear ones owning individual names. Instances are *Crassi tui*, *Curio filius*, *Lentulus puer* (the infant grandson of Cicero, adopted by a Lentulus), *Lentulus adolescens*, *Lentulus tuus*, *Lucullus puer*.⁵

¹ *Pro Muren.* 13: *Qua re, cum ista sis auctoritate, non debes, Marce. . . .* Cf. also the use of the praenomen *Gai* by Cincius in answer to the slighting diminutive *Cinciole* (*De orat.* ii. 286).

² *Fam.* v. 17. 2; *Att.* xi. 10. 1; xi. 16. 4; *passim*.

³ *Fam.* xiv. 4. 6; *De off.* i. 1. 14 and 78; ii. 1; iii. 1 and 12.

⁴ *De off.* i. 3; ii. 44; iii. 5. 121.

⁵ *Att.* ii. 19. 3; ii. 24. 2; xii. 28. 3; xii. 30. 1; xiii. 6. 2; *Fam.* v. 8. 2; i. 7. 11. On the other hand, the mother of the adult Carvilius calls him *mi Spuri* (*De orat.* ii. 249). The phrase *ego et Marcus filius* which is supplied in *De orat.* 224 from *Pro Cluent.* 141 is uncertain, as some editors read *Brutus filius*.

VII. NOMEN AND COGNOMEN

We may discuss these two names together since their functions do not materially differ in the literature we are examining. They occur about equally often and there are many more cases of either than of any other forms of the name. Their uses, however, are few. The principal, if not the only, situation in which either one is found is when it serves as a rough but sufficiently complete indication of some person in the following cases:

1. *Repeated reference*.—One who has been mentioned before may be again referred to by the single nomen or cognomen. Illustrations are too numerous to need citation.

2. *Prominent men*.—Well-known public men like Caesar, Pompey, Brutus, Antony, and a host of others have but the one name on every page. The less prominent relatives of these are generally distinguished by an additional name, but very often the student has difficulty in determining which Piso, which Marcellus, which Lucullus, for example, is meant—an ambiguity not so troublesome, of course, to the ancient correspondents with their fresh and intimate knowledge of contemporary men. A noteworthy fact in this connection is that Pompey often bears the praenomen, Caesar rarely. The latter seems in the numberless places in which he is called to mind like an impersonal force dominating and directing the trend of affairs. Sometimes, however, the single name in close proximity to the double name indicates a slur, e.g., *Vatini . . . P. Sestio*. Vatinius is always addressed with the one name in the speech in which this passage occurs, Sestius almost always with two.

When the nomen or cognomen occurs in the vocative the possessive *mi* is usually prefixed, and this combination is a courteous address indicating informal relations but not necessarily great intimacy; e.g., *mi Cassi*, *mi Varro*, *mi Paete*, *mi Capito*.¹

3. *Unimportant characters*.—Slaves, freedman, clerks, petty officers, and others are regularly mentioned with but one name, unless there is possible confusion. Doubtless the writers knew but one name for most of them.

¹ *Fam.* xii. 1. 1; ix. 8. 2; ix. 16. 2; *Att.* xvi. 16. 12 and 17. Capito was not a very welcome guest to Cicero (*Att.* xiii. 33).

A very puzzling usage presents itself here, which has been touched upon in the foregoing treatment of the praenomen-nomen and praenomen-cognomen. Some men who had both nomen and cognomen are given the one at one time, the other at another, often for no apparent reason. In some cases the reason is plain, as with Pompey, who is called in the *Pro Archia* (x. 24) *noster ille Magnus* in close association with Alexander Magnus. In the letters he is also so named twice in punning,¹ and three times when an allusion to the meaning doubtless was responsible for its use.² In other cases there are good reasons, although they are not evident at first sight. Pomponius, for example, occurs for the more common Atticus, and the following facts seem to show that Pomponius was a private name, restricted to letters to relatives or to very close friends: first, all others than these call him Atticus only; secondly, Cicero uses no other designation than Pomponius when he writes to Terentia or Quintus;³ thirdly, to the slaves of Atticus he uses the name Pomponius;⁴ fourthly, Cicero always calls him Atticus in letters to others with two exceptions, viz., in a formal note to C. Antonius in 61 B.C. when the nickname Atticus possibly had not come into general public use;⁵ and in the epistle to Varro which dedicated the *Academica*.⁶

In most instances, however, these two names are indifferently employed. Curtius and Postumus are the same man, as are Ampius

¹ *Att.* ii. 13. 2: *quanto in odio noster amicus Magnus, cuius cognomen . . . senescit*; ii. 19. 3: *Noster miseria tu es Magnus* (quoted from Diphilus).

² *Att.* i. 16. 12; i. 20. 5; vi. 1. 22 (Tyrrell, *ad loc.*). Tyrrell, *op. cit.*, III, 181, note, says Magnus was Pompey's name very frequently, but I have found only eight cases, of which *Att.* vi. 1. 25 and *Fam.* viii. 13 are doubtful and due to Tyrrell's emendation; in *Att.* vii. 16. 3. *magnus* is a common adjective.

³ *Fam.* xiv. 5. 2; xiv. 10; xiv. 14. 2; xiv. 19; *Quint. fr.* i. 3. 8; i. 4. 2; ii. 4. 5; ii. 9. 3; ii. 10. 2.

⁴ *Att.* ii. 8.

⁵ *Fam.* v. 5. 1. The name Atticus does not occur till 59 B.C. when Cicero says he will call him by that term (*Att.* ii. 20. 5).

⁶ *Fam.* ix. 8. 1. In the *Academica* itself Atticus is referred to several times by that name, once as Pomponius. He is never addressed. The fact that Pomponius is the only name given him by Piso, Cicero, and others in the fifth book of the *De fin.* is no objection to this hypothesis, for the dramatic date of this dialogue is 79 B.C. and Atticus was not yet a real cognomen. This is evident from *De fin.* v. 4: *ita enim se Athenis collocavit ut sit paene unus ex Atticis, ut id etiam cognomen videatur habiturus*. Furthermore, in the *Brutus* the very few instances of the nomen Pomponius in the vocative or other cases are all put in the mouth of Cicero himself; yet the name Atticus in all cases is much more frequent.

and Balbus, Asinius and Pollio, Trebatius and Testa, Sempronius and Rufus, Caninius and Rebilus, Mucius and Scaevola, and many others. For these variants I can suggest only a tentative explanation. It is well known that certain families were almost always spoken of by their nomina, as Pompeius and Cassius, others by their cognomina, as Caesar and Brutus. The latter were those branches which wanted to be distinguished from the *gentes* because they were of such age, numbers, or influence as to be almost equivalent to a new *gens*. Thus the descendants of Fabius Maximus were the Maximi, and the case is similar with the Scipios, Metelli, Lucilli, Pisos, and others.¹

Now these fluctuating appellations² may belong to families in an intermediate stage where the branch is just in the process of differentiation from the *gens* in public estimation, and the family itself is not much more proud or fond of the one name than of the other. We must remember also, as I have stated above, that whereas the majority of cognomina connoted the nomina, the converse is not true, and furthermore, some cognomina belonged to several *gentes*.³ Among these there would naturally be greater vacillation between the two ways of designation than among those men whose cognomina were confined to definitely known *gentes*.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion I summarize the principal functions of the various forms which have been discussed, using the name of Varro as a model, with one or two others for special cases.

1. Official mention, complete identification, laudatory allusion, or formal introduction and recommendation: M. Terentius Varro.
2. Less formal introduction of one already known by name to the addressee: M. Varro; still less politely, but more cordially: M. Terentius.

¹ Pompey's cognomen, on the other hand, was acquired in 81 B.C., too late to be used by him or his children very widely.

² E.g., Lucilius Balbus is addressed in the *De natura deorum* as *Balbe* (i. 16, 22, 36, 50; iii. 1. 5); as *Lucili* also (i. 20, 25, 47). He is referred to as Balbus in iii. 2, 4, 5, 13, 15, 17, 21, 27, 35, 51, 53, 93, and 95; as *Lucilius* in iii. 3, 13, and 94.

³ Flaccus is the cognomen of certain Furnii, Valerii, Fulvii, Laenii, and others; Gallus of some Cornelii, Fadii, Sulpicii; Rufus of Sulpicii and Pompeii.

3. Emphatic mention for honor or disparagement: M. Varro; more rarely and emotionally: M. Terentius Varro.

4. Merely sufficient designation to enable the reader to recognize the person intended, the choice of the nomen or cognomen being determined by the prevailing custom for his family: M. Varro, but C. Cassius (not Longinus), M. Caelius (not Rufus).

5. Much less polite, often slurring, allusion; casual mention, the second name added as an afterthought: Tillius Cimber, or Cimber Tillius.

6. Subsequent reference to one previously more fully named: Manlius; Rufus.

7. Casual or cursory reference to a well-known man: Pompeius; Caesar.

8. Allusion to unimportant persons; Matrinius; Hispo.

9. Affection or intimacy, sincere or ironical: Marcus, *Marcus noster*, or *Marcus meus*.

10. Covert allusion: Marcus.

11. Reference to another's son: *tuus Varro*; rarely *tuus Marcus*.

12. Reference to one's own son, at least to one's only or first son: Varro; *Varro noster*. Very rarely: *Marcus noster*.

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

THE *TINUS* IN VIRGIL'S FLORA

By H. RUSHTON FAIRCLOUGH

According to two passages in the fourth Georgic, viz., ll. 112 and 141, Virgil's flora seems to include the *tinus*. The former passage runs:

ipse thymum tinosque ferens de montibus altis
tecta serat late circum, quoi talia curae.

Here, of the capital MSS available, FMP, both the Mediceus, first hand, and the Palatinus read *tinus*. The Vatican Fragment has *pinos*, which is also the reading of the cursive and late MSS.

In the second passage,

illi tiliae atque uberrima tinus,

M, first hand, reads *tinus*, P and the later MSS giving *pinus*. F does not preserve the passage. Philargyrius knows both readings for both passages, and at 141 adds the curious remark that Virgil himself left the word doubtful: *ipsius autem manu duplex fuit scriptura*. It will thus be seen that in these passages the authority for *tinus*, rather than *pinus*, is very strong, and it is not surprising that Ribbeck should have adopted it. Hirtzel, the latest editor, accepts *tinus* in 112, but *pinus* in 141, though, as we hope to show, both passages call for the same word. In the *Culex*, 407, *semper florida tinus*, where the MSS all show *pinus*, Ribbeck and Ellis follow Salmasius in giving *tinus*.

Differing as they do in only the initial letter, *tinus* and *pinus* must often have been paleographical rivals, and as the latter was much the commoner word, it is evident that *pinus* would be more likely to oust *tinus* than vice versa, especially where the context was not a sufficient protection for the less familiar term. It may be observed that in both lines cited from the *Georgics*, the word *tinus* would furnish alliteration, a device very common in Virgil: *thymum* [*th=t*] *tinosque, tiliae . . . tinus* (cf. *Ecl.* vii. 24, *pendebit . . . pinu*; *Aen.* v. 153, *pondere pinus tarda tenet*). In Palladius I. xxxvii. 2, a list of trees suitable for the *apium castra* closes with

[CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY X, October, 1915] 405

cedrus, tilia, ilex minor et tinus. Here the Vienna MS V gives *thinus*, while minor MSS give *pinus, linus*, or *cinus* (Schmitt, in the Teubner ed. 1898, gives *linus*).

The two passages cited from the *Georgics* are associated with bees. Virgil urges his bee-keeper to have attractive gardens, fragrant with flowers,

invitent croceis halantes floribus horti,

and to set out about the hives thyme and *tinus* (or *pinus*), both of which he is to bring *de montibus altis*.

The mention of gardens leads the poet to make the interesting statement that, if he had more space at his command, he would gladly add gardening to his themes and would sing of flowers and vegetables—of the rose, narcissus, and acanthus; of the ivy and myrtle; of the endive, parsley, and gourd. Then in beautiful fashion he recalls the old Corycian, who had cultivated a few acres of unclaimed ground near Tarentum and had transformed very unpromising soil into a wonderful garden, rich in fruits and flowers. Here he had “planted herbs among the bushes, with white lilies about, and vervain, and slender poppy. . . . He was first to pluck roses in spring and apples in autumn.” Before winter had passed, “he was already culling the soft hyacinth’s bloom. . . . So he, too, was first to be enriched with mother-bees and a plenteous swarm, the first to gather frothing honey from the squeezed comb. Luxuriant were his limes and pines [according to the common reading *pinus*]; and all the fruits his bounteous tree donned in its early bloom, full as many it kept in the ripeness of autumn. He, too, planted out in rows elms far-grown,” etc.

In this attractive passage Virgil, as Conington says, is “sketching the plan for what might have been a fifth Georgic, and connecting the subject with his own personal observations.” He is therefore not limiting himself to the subject of bees, though at the same time he introduces little that may not be associated with them. Thus the fact that the old Corycian’s tree-blossoms all came to fruit was due, as is well known, to the activity of his bees, and Virgil’s selection of trees and flowers contains very little that might not be included today in an authoritative list of honey- and pollen-producing

plants. Bevan,¹ writing on the pasturage suitable for bees, recommends a great variety of plants, including the white lily, ivy, and gourd. Root's more extensive list² includes also the elm, vervain, and wild rose.³

But, according to the common text, there is one plant that in such a context seems strangely out of place. While the fragrant wild thyme has always been famous as a favorite of bees, and while Cheshire⁴ tells us that "the lime-groves, spreading their choice perfume, and merry with the hum of ten thousand busy wings glistening in the July sun, gladden the heart of the bee-keeper,"⁵ yet no modern authority, so far as I can learn, recommends the pine as furnishing congenial pasturage for bees.

It is well known that, in reference to fertilization, flowering plants are either entomophilous or anemophilous. The former, generally possessed of showy blossoms, are fertilized by bees or other insects, which carry the pollen from one flower to another; the latter, fertilized by the wind, have blossoms dull in color and nearly devoid of honey or perfume. It is to the anemophilous class that pines belong, and everybody is familiar with the way in which they shower their cream-colored pollen in the forests. Bees may use this pine-pollen to some extent, but they will use it only as a substitute for something better, just as they will use flour or meal of grain or even sawdust.⁶

Commentators are therefore puzzled over Virgil's coupling of the pine with the *tilia* or the *thymus*. Thus Page says: "The pine is mentioned as acceptable, possibly for its resinous exudations, but more probably for the sake of the clouds of pollen-dust produced by the ripe male cones"; and Royds, in his recent book, writes: "The *uberrima pinus* was presumably planted for propolis, but also for pollen from the ripe male cones, whence the epithet."⁷

Now it is true that bees need both propolis or bee-glue and pollen, the latter as food, the former for closing up the cells and for cementing

¹ *The Honey Bee*, Philadelphia, 1843.

² *The ABC of Bee Culture*, 1908.

³ Cf. also Benton's *The Honey Bee*, Bulletin No. 1, N.S. (3d ed.), U.S. Department of Agriculture, Division of Entomology, 1899.

⁴ *Bees and Bee-Keeping*, II, 358.

⁵ Cf. Shuckard, *British Bees*, p. 15.

⁶ Root, p. 326.

⁷ *The Beasts, Birds and Bees of Virgil*, p. 72.

the comb to the hive, but it is also true that no bee-keeper, at least in a country like Italy, would think it necessary to plant pines for such a purpose. Italy is a country where, as in California, the climatic and floral conditions are unusually favorable for bees, and the best kinds of pollen are both available and abundant. As to propolis, the bee-keeper usually regards it as a nuisance, and he would certainly never take pains to provide his bees with an unnecessary supply. "Our principal trouble," says Root, "has been to get rid of the surplus propolis, and I should much rather hear of some invention to keep it out of the way than to add more."¹

Instead of *pinus*, we have seen that there is good reason to suppose that, in both of the Virgilian lines in the *Georgics*, *tinus* should be read. What is the *tinus*?

Philargyrius describes the *tinus* as a *laurus silvestris caerulea baca*, "a wild laurel with a dark-blue berry," and Ovid (*Met.* 10. 98) includes among the many trees which Orpheus drew toward him by his music the *bacis caerulea tinus*. Pliny, too (N.H. xv. 30 [39]. 127), when enumerating the laurels, adds: *postea accessere genera; tinus—hanc silvestrem laurum aliqui intellegunt, nonnulli sui generis arborem—differt colore; est enim caerulea baca*; and in xvii. 11, sec. 60, he names three kinds of laurel, viz., *augusta et bacalis et tinus*. Thus the ancients regarded the *tinus* as a wild laurel, though this, of course, is an incorrect view. Our modern *laurus silvestris* is a poisonous plant, confined to the eastern States of North America, and no kind of European *laurus* fits the description.

For the identification of the plant I have to thank my colleague, Professor Leroy Abrams, who informs me that *tinus* is a pre-Linnaean name for the plant now known as *Viburnum tinus* L. In his *Species Plantarum* (1753), Linnaeus cites the *tinus* of Clusius (1601) and the *laurus sylvestris* of Bauhin (1671). Tournefort (1719) uses the name *tinus*; Bauhin (*Pinax*, p. 461), both *laurus* and *tinus*. According to Linnaeus, the *Viburnum tinus* is distributed in "Lusitania, Hispania and Italia." It is an evergreen, winter-flowering shrub or tree, found in great abundance in Italy, and especially in Corsica, where it forms large forests and grows to a height of ten to twenty feet. "It has dark, shining, leathery leaves, small whitish flowers in

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 333.

corymbs, and small blackish-blue berries." In England and America, where it is cultivated as a garden-shrub, it is commonly known as the laurustinus or laurestine, a word which not only preserves the original term *tinus*, but also indicates the plant's supposed connection with the laurel. In California it is very popular in shrubberies and hedges, and wherever it is grown it is much frequented by the bees. Bevan (p. 25) includes it among "the earliest resources of the bee" in the spring of the year, along with the snowdrop, the crocus, and white alyssum. The Italians call it *lentaggine*.

This, then, is the shrub or tree (either term may be applied to it, according to the *Century Dictionary*) which, along with the limes or lindens, grew in such profusion in the old Corycian's garden, and this it is which, together with thyme, the poet would have his bee-keeper "bring from high mountains and plant widely round the hives."

Virgil's reference to the *alti montes* may possibly have made it easier to substitute *pinus* for *tinus*, and some may even now find in the expression a defense for the pine as opposed to the laurestine, for references to the pines on mountains are common enough, as in *G.* ii. 443; *Aen.* v. 449; x. 230; xi. 134, etc., and the laurestine is not peculiarly associated in our minds with mountains as is the pine. But, as is well known, the word *montes* does not necessarily denote "mountains" in our sense, for it is used of the hills of Rome, even as in *Aen.* viii. 321 Virgil speaks of the *montes alti* of Latium. Palinurus, on swimming to land, clutched the *capita aspera montis* (*Aen.* vi. 360), and Capo Miseno on the Bay of Naples is called a *mons aerius* (*Aen.* vi. 234). Virgil's farmer is to dig trenches through the hillocks, *agnos montis* (*G.* ii. 260), and the wooden horse is built *instar montis* (*Aen.* ii. 15).

Further, *alti* is a purely poetic or conventional epithet with *montes*. Thus at *G.* iii. 412 the hunter forces the stag into his nets *montis per altos*, and at *G.* iii. 535 we learn that when tilling the ground men had to dispense with cattle and draw the wagons themselves *montis per altos*. Other illustrations are to be found in *Ecl.* i. 83; vii. 66; *G.* i. 357; *Aen.* i. 61; ii. 635; iii. 644, 675; vii. 563; viii. 321; x. 707; xii. 523.

In *G.* iv. 112, therefore, the bee-keeper is directed to the *alti montes*, because it is in the hills, rather than in the plains, that he will

find the early-blooming laurestine as well as the fragrant wild thyme, such as abounds on the sides of Mount Hymettus in Attica. Both the *Thymus vulgaris* (common thyme) and the *Thymus capitatus* are "common on dry hills in South Europe," and Virgil's farmer would not have to go up very far to find them. It is noteworthy that in Corsica, where the laurestine is so abundant, the surface of the land is almost wholly mountainous, and in olden times "honey and wax were the chief productions of the island."

In view, then, both of manuscript evidence and of intrinsic probability, we are convinced that the *tinus* is the plant intended by Virgil in the two lines cited from the *Georgics*. At the same time we must admit that *pinus* was substituted for *tinus* at a very early day, for not only have we the statement by Philargyrius that Virgil himself left the word doubtful, but we find that Columella, who is largely indebted to Virgil and frequently cites him, includes among the plants to be cultivated for bees the *semper virens pinus* (*De re rustica* ix, chap. 4). It may well be that Columella found *pinus* in the two passages of the *Georgics*. The substitution may have been made easy by Virgil's own reference in *Ecl.* vii. 65, 68, to the pine as a garden-tree. Some of the pines are very ornamental, and in the great public *horti* of the Romans the pine was probably very conspicuous. We at once recall the beautiful pines of the Villa Borghese. Such parks, however, have little to do with the garden of Virgil's bee-keeper in the *Georgics*.

For illustrations of the Viburnum Tinus, the reader is referred to Hemsley's *Handbook of Hardy Trees, Shrubs, and Herbaceous Plants* (Boston 1873), p. 223, and Nicholson's *Dictionary of Gardening* (Century Supplement, London, 1901), p. 736. An illustration in colors may be seen in Strasburger's *Streifzüge an der Riviera* (Jena, 1904), p. 449.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CAL.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WING-ENTRANCES IN ROMAN COMEDY

BY ELEANOR F. RAMBO

A good annotated edition of any play of Plautus or Terence generally contains in the Introduction a slight account of the scenic arrangements. A typical statement is that found in the *Phormio*, ed. Dziatzko (4th ed., 1913, by Hauler), p. 37: "The proscenium represents an open street. . . . On the right (spectator's), the street led to the market place and city proper; on the left, to the harbor and foreign parts."

This, the traditional interpretation of the significance of the two wing-entrances, is for the most part accepted by editors without comment or question, except in the case of the *Rudens* and the *Heauton Timoroumenos*.¹ The tradition has come down to us from antiquity, crystallized, not from internal evidence of the drama, but from a passage in Vitruvius, *De architectura* v. 6, 8 (Krohn): "Ipsae autem scaenae suas habent rationes ita explicatas uti mediae valvae ornatus habeant aulae regiae, dextra ac sinistra hospitalia, secundum autem spatia ad ornatus comparata—*περίακτους*—secundum ea loca versurae sunt procurrentes quae efficiunt una a foro, altera a peregre aditus in scaenam."²

Now in the preceding chapters of book v, which is devoted to public buildings (*publicorum dispositiones*), Vitruvius describes the Roman theater, with its stage wider than that of the Greeks, its blocks of seats in the orchestra for senators, all in detail, even to the ornamentation of the columns. Then follows the passage quoted, and after it, "In Graecorum theatris non omnia isdem rationibus sunt facienda." In other words, the passage "una a foro, altera a peregre" comes from a bit of description of the Roman variety of theater, and the two opposed entrances, one from the forum, the other from foreign parts, are characteristic of the Roman stage arrangement. One therefore expects plays written for this Roman

¹ See pp. 425 and 428.

² Usually dated 16–15 B.C.; but according to Krohn (ed. 1912), 40–30 B.C.

stage to be in the matter of entrances *a foro* and *a peregre* consistent with the construction of the theater; and, remembering that the permanent theater here described was erected after the dramatic conventions were fixed, one expects the two entrances facing each other to be so situated because plays to be revived and produced in such a theater demand such entrances. Unfortunately, Vitruvius does not specify which entrance is on the right and which on the left.¹

One Plautine play, the *Rudens*, however, seems to defy the Vitruvian tradition. The scene is laid on the seashore; from one and the same side of the stage one goes to both city and harbor (vs. 856). The question then arises, Is this situation of town and harbor only an exception to the rule? or is it, despite the statement of Vitruvius, the normal arrangement?² or is there no fixed significance in entrances and exits at the wings? If this last be true, such expressions as *forum*, *portus*, *rus*, etc., found in Roman comedy, are merely translations of conventions in the Greek originals of the plays, and are, for purposes of Roman stage topography, quite meaningless.³ If, on the other hand, these words have meaning as Roman stage-directions, and if the places indicated by the words *forum* and *portus* lie off the same end of the stage as indicated in the *Rudens*, then the Vitruvian tradition is negligible because false, at least for the period of the early drama.

In addition to the passage from Vitruvius, we have a statement by Pollux (second century A.D.). In the *Onomasticon*, Δ 124, Pollux describes the setting of the stage in the theater, telling of three doors in the back wall, and explaining their significance. Then follows (Δ 126 ff.): *παρ' ἐκάτερα δὲ τῶν δύνων θυρῶν τῶν περὶ τὴν μέσσην ἄλλαι δύο εἶεν αὖν, μία ἐκατέρωθεν, πρὸς ἃς αἱ περιὰκτοι συμπεπήγασι, ἡ μὲν δεξιὰ τὰ ἔξω πόλεως δηλοῦσα, ἡ δ' ἑτέρα τὰ ἐκ πόλεως, μάλιστα ἐκ λιμένος.* This account, locating city and harbor off the same side of the stage, opposite what is possibly to be interpreted as the

¹ Vitruvius is here describing the setting for tragedy, not for *comœdia palliata*, extant specimens of which, except the *Amphitruo*, do not need *aulae regiae*. For references to this feature of the stage-setting in tragedy, see Accius (R) *Clut.* i; *Neopt.* vi.

² This viewpoint is championed by Albert Mueller, *Philol.*, LIX (1900), 9 ff.

³ So Kelley Rees, *AJP*, XXXII (1911), 400, note, citing as instances, *Rudens* 856 (city and harbor on the left), *Amphitruo* 333 (harbor on actor's right), *Andria* 732 (forum on actor's right.).

entrance *rure*—τὰ ξέω πόλεως—would seem to indicate as normal the stage-arrangement demanded by *Rudens*, vs. 856.¹

But before casting Vitruvius aside for Pollux, one should weigh carefully the authority of each. Vitruvius is a Roman, writing of things Roman two centuries before Pollux. Pollux (Δ 121) defines his remarks on the theater as applying only to the Dionysiac theater in Athens. No allowance is made by him for Roman variation. All quotations given as illustrating variation in detail of arrangement come with one exception from Greek tragedy. The one exception is from Old Comedy. Now Plautus and Terence find inspiration and material in New Comedy, rules and regulations for which are vainly sought in the field of Old Comedy. Were it not for the *Rudens*, one would be inclined to consider Pollux negligible; but as matters stand, we have two traditions, quite irreconcilable. According to one, forum and harbor lie off opposite ends of the stage; according to the other, they lie off the same end of the stage.

Examination of all the plays in the matter of exits and entrances will, from internal evidence, prove whether or not either tradition actually holds. Before proceeding to such analysis, however, it will be well to note the following considerations about stage-conventions:

1. Probably the ultimate source of such conventions is, for *comœdia palliata*, the Dionysiac theater in Athens. Because of the situation of this theater, certain procedures become convention, not arbitrarily, but necessarily. The Dionysiac theater lies on the south-east slope of the Acropolis. To the spectator's right (actor's left), lie the Peiraeus and the city generally; to the spectator's left (actor's right), lies the open country, all visible because the theater is roofless. No geographical illusion is possible in such a building, when plays are locally placed. Accordingly, no Athenian dramatist would venture to have a character leave the stage to the spectator's left with the remark that he was going to the Peiraeus. Therefore, for Greek New Comedy, of necessity the spectator's right gives egress εἰς ἀγορᾶν and εἰς λιμένα, the spectator's left, to the country. But when plays written for production in a theater demanding such conventions are translated into Latin for production in Rome, in

¹ For further discussion of this passage, see p. 425.

view of the liberties of *contaminatio* and other alterations of Greek originals, it is too much to expect the literal translation of conventional stage-directions that are meaningless at Rome. For the Roman theaters, though built often on hillsides, were not in one fixed place,¹ and were only temporary, so that external topography cannot avail to fix conventions in the Roman theater. Furthermore, the Roman harbor, Ostia, is to the urban, non-traveling Roman of far less consequence than is the Peiraeus to the restless Athenian. Plautus and Terence may translate *eis áγοράν* by *ad forum*, and *ἐκ λιμένος* by *a portu*, but to the Roman spectator there is not, as to the Athenian, a sense of indubitable location, especially as no *palliat*a is laid in Rome. All that the Roman could feel, unless he were exceptionally acute, would be that the harbor was some distance away, but the *forum* just around the corner. The fact that he was in Rome and the play supposedly in Athens would have small effect on his better grasp of Greek conventions. To him, harbor and forum might be off the same side or off different sides of the stage. It would scarcely matter. The point is that as Plautus and Terence are good playwrights, they would know better than to keep hard and fast to a meaningless convention; they must make stage-topography clear to their rude audiences. If there is a convention, there is a reason for its being. In other words, it should "work."

2. According to convention, a character entering on the stage must come either: (1) from a house or temple fronting on the stage;² or (2) *a foro* (whether by the wing or *angiportum*³), that is, from the 'change, promenade, place of local interests, both business and social; or (3) *a portu* or *a peregre*, any place *relatively* foreign to the *vicinity*; or (4) *rure*. Likewise, when he leaves the stage he must go either: (1) *intro*, into a building facing on the stage; or (2) *ad forum*, to consult friends and lawyers, to market, etc.; or (3) *ad portum* or *peregre*, to board ship or meet travelers from abroad, etc.; or (4) *rus*. If having left the stage he return in the course of the action, he must return by the door through which he had departed, e.g., if he go

¹See Miss Saunders, *Trans. A. Ph. A.*, XLIV (1913), 87 ff.

²On these entrances, cf. W. W. Mooney, *The House-Door on the Ancient Stage*, Princeton Dissertation, Baltimore, 1914.

³For discussion of the uses of the *angiportum*, see A. Mueller, *Philol.*, LIX (1900), 15 ff.

ad forum, he must return *a foro*; or else he must explain his unexpected action¹ (see *Stichus* 674 ff.; *Phormio* 312).

SURVEY OF THE PLAYS

In *Amphitruo* 148,² Sosia enters *a portu*, while Mercurius is standing before Amphitruo's palace. At vs. 333 Mercurius says, "hinc enim mihi dextra uox auris ut uidetur uerberat." Since he is facing the audience, Sosia must come from spectator's left.³

A second passage helps to locate the local entrance. At vs. 854 Amphitruo departs to the harbor "huc ab naui amicum adducam Naucratem." He returns at vs. 1009 without his friend, for whom he has searched everywhere, including places in the city; therefore he returns *a foro*. If harbor and forum lie off the same side of the stage he will leave and return by the same door, but his long explanation will be uncalled for. If, however, harbor and forum are opposite each other, then the long explanation can have but one meaning: he is telling why he comes from an unexpected quarter (*a foro*).

In the *Amphitruo*, then, forum and harbor lie opposite each other, and the entrance *a portu* is on the spectator's left.

There is another passage from this play that should be mentioned here, although it affords no direct evidence for locating the disputed entrances. At vs. 551 Sosia and Amphitruo enter *a portu*

¹ There are some apparent exceptions to this rule, e.g.: (1) *Adelphoe* 354: Canthara goes for a midwife and the two women must be in the house at vs. 486, but nothing is said of their entrance. (2) *Asinaria* 248: Argyrippus goes *ad forum*; at vs. 329 he is *intus*, but his reappearance is not until vs. 591, and then from the house of Cleaereta. (3) *Bacchides* 769: Nicobulus enters by the *ostium*, but on his last exit (vs. 348) he had gone *ad forum*. (4) *Curculio* 524: Curculio and Planesium leave stage *peregre*, but Curculio returns at vs. 591 from the house of Phaedromus. (5) *Trinummus* 1120: Lysiteles, who had entered from a house on the stage, says that he has just met Stasimus, who had gone *ad portum*. The explanation of such passages probably lies in the fact that houses on the stage are sometimes thought of as having an entrance in the rear; cf. *Epid.* 660; *Most.* 1043 ff., which persons in the play use as short cuts; or the inconsistencies may be due to the carelessness of Plautus and Terence in not giving information.

² The citations are from Lindsay's text.

³ It is very important to distinguish the viewpoint of the actors from that of the spectators. Normally the actors face the audience, and "right" from the actors' viewpoint is spectators' "left." In some passages, of course, an actor may have to turn his back to the audience; cf. *And.* 732; *Curc.* 70; *Rud.* 176, etc. Failure to make this distinction has given rise to statements that in this passage the harbor lay to the right of the spectators. See Professor Rees, for example (*op. cit.*), and Professor Lindsay's note on *Capt.* 900 and 921 (ed. of 1900).

immediately after Iuppiter (cf. vs. 533) has departed *ex urbe*. The deceived and the deceiver ought not to meet at this point,¹ and they need not meet, although they use the same door, if we assume that after vs. 550 there was a pause²—that vs. 550 ends an “act.” It is barely possible that at vs. 550 Iuppiter goes *rus*. In that event, as *rus* may be reached by the exit *ad forum*³ this passage would afford evidence for the opposition of the two entrances.

In *Asinaria*, at vs. 267, Leonida enters *a foro*, and, finding Libanus, relates his chance meeting with the *Chlamydatus*. The two slaves plot to secure for themselves the money due the steward Saurea. At vs. 378 the *Chlamydatus* is seen in the distance; whereupon (vs. 380) Leonida runs *ad forum* to warn Demaenetus, and also to carry out his own part in the plot—the impersonation of the steward. The *Chlamydatus*, who is represented consistently as a man of sense and caution, must not see the pseudo-Saurea until the psychological moment (vs. 407). If, as he enters, he sees a man rush madly past him, and shortly after return as a pompous steward, is it possible that his suspicions will not be aroused? Evidently, the stranger does not enter by the door through which Leonida departed. As a foreigner, he should come *a peregre*, but he has been *in tonstrina*, i.e., *in foro*. However, Leonida (vs. 357) has already said that the *Chlamydatus* would not come direct from the barber-shop, “*ille in balineas iturust, inde huc veniet postea*.” In other words, for the sake of the plot, Leonida must see the stranger before the latter enters, but when the *Chlamydatus* actually appears, he comes *a peregre*. The entrance *a peregre* cannot here coincide with that *a foro*; but there is nothing to determine on which side either entrance lies.

In *Aulularia*, at vs. 473, Euclio, outside his house, near the exit *ad forum* (vs. 171), seeking a place to hide his gold, sees Megadorus coming *a foro*, and grumbles that he must stop to talk with him. That is, Megadorus must pass Euclio's house in order to reach his

¹ That such meetings were avoided is shown by *Merc.* 219 ff.

² Such pauses (in addition to that proved by *Pseud.* 573) are now well recognized (cf. *Bacc.* 107), although the question of the acts has not been settled; cf. Leo in *Hermes*, XLVI (1911), 292 ff., where the evidence is summed up. Other evidence of pause in the action may be found in the internal prologue in the *Miles* 79 ff., and *Cist.* 149 ff., and the speech of the *Choragus* in *Curc.* 462 ff. Cf. C. C. Conrad, *The Technique of Continuous Action in Roman Comedy*. Diss., Chicago, 1915.

³ See on the location of the exit *rus*, pp. 430-31.

own. At vs. 676 Euclio departs to the grove of Silvanus—*extra murum*—which for purposes of this play is *peregre*.¹ On his return (vs. 713) he laments outside the house of Megadorus, which is, therefore, near the exit *extra murum*. Therefore the exit *peregre* is opposite that *a foro*.²

In *Bacchides*, at vs. 384, Lydus departs to find Philoxenus, whose house is not on the stage. At vs. 385 Mnesilochus enters *a portu*. The two do not meet. Therefore Lydus, who uses the local exit, cannot leave the stage by the door through which Mnesilochus enters. The local exit cannot coincide with the entrance *a portu*.

In *Captivi*, at vs. 497, Ergasilus, the parasite, goes *ad portum*, saying that there lies "mi una spes cenatica, si ea decollabit redibo huc ad senem ad cenam." Evidently, then, he does not see Hegio, who, ripe for a "touch," enters at vs. 498 *a foro*. Forum and harbor cannot lie off the same end of the stage.

At vs. 765 Hegio goes *ad forum*. At vs. 768 Ergasilus enters *a portu*, intent on finding Hegio. The fact that they have not met argues for the opposition of the entrances.

Furthermore, when Hegio returns, at vs. 781, Ergasilus is *procul*, an expression that is intelligible only if the two be separated by a distance nearly the length of the stage. This again argues for the opposition of the entrances.

A fourth passage is less convincing because of the intrusion of the exit *rus*, not yet located; but it is significant. At vs. 750 Tyndarus is led off to the quarries, therefore *rus*; but first he is to go to the blacksmith. He therefore departs *ad forum*. At vs. 997 he returns from the quarries by the door opposite Hegio's entrance *a portu*. This seems to indicate that the exit *rus* coincides with that *ad forum*.³ At least forum and harbor cannot be off the same end of the stage. When Tyndarus returns there is no comment to

¹ There is a possibility that the exit *extra murum* is the exit *rus*; but *extra murum* in this play stands in place of *extra portam* in other plays, and as it is the only non-local relation involved, I call it *peregre*. For the relative meanings of the terms *ad forum* and *peregre*, see on the *Rudens*, p. 425, and for location of the entrance *rure*, pp. 430 ff.

² This statement is to be read with the broad interpretation of *peregre*. The conclusion means merely that the place of non-local interests is not reached by the exit to the place of local interests (*forum*). This interpretation covers the possibility that *extra murum* is *rus*.

³ See pp. 430-31.

indicate appearance from an unexpected quarter. Therefore, having gone *ad forum*, he returns *a foro*. There is no internal evidence for the exact placing of either exit.

Both *Casina* and *Cistellaria* need only the exit *ad forum*; there is nothing to indicate its location.

In *Curculio*, at vs. 1, Phaedromus enters from his house, passes the temple of Aesculapius (vs. 14), and reaches the *leno's* door. This he faces during his ecstasy, so that at vs. 70 *dextrouorsum* must be interpreted as the shrine of Aesculapius in contradistinction to that of Venus, before which he and his slave stand. The *leno's* house is, then, at the left side of the stage.

At vs. 280 Curculio enters *a peregre*¹ (vs. 275). Palinurus, standing before the shrine, sees him coming (vs. 274), and calls Phaedromus out from his house. The two are not seen by Curculio until vs. 305. Obviously, he enters, not near the house of Phaedromus, but at the opposite end of the stage, near the *leno's* door. Thus the entrance *a peregre* is on the spectator's left.

At vs. 371 Lyco enters *a foro*. As he salutes the shrine of Aesculapius he is seen by Curculio, who, unobserved by him, enters from the house of Phaedromus. Lyco, then, had already passed this house. Therefore the entrance *a foro* is near this house and so on the spectator's right. This conclusion holds despite the fact that Curculio pretends to Lyco that he comes from the Captain, and so from foreign parts, for the audience has seen Curculio enter and knows that he is tricking the banker.

This location of the entrance *a foro* is confirmed by vs. 610, where Therapontigonus enters *a foro*, and immediately comes upon Curculio as he talks with Planesium and Phaedromus before the latter's door; and further by vss. 679 ff., where the *leno* enters *a foro*, rushes toward his own house past the group in front of the house of Phaedromus, and is called back by them.

Vs. 533, however, is at variance with these conclusions. Therapontigonus enters with Lyco. The Captain should enter *a peregre*, for Curculio had taken "French leave" of him in Caria (vs. 363). Lyco had at vs. 526 gone *ad forum*, and should enter *a foro*. That the two enter together argues perhaps for the coincidence of the two

¹ For discussion of the scene of this play, see Wilamowitz, ap. Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 221.

entrances; but in view of the evidence offered by the first five passages, such arrangement is impossible. We may have here evidence of *retractatio* or of a *lacuna*.

The play *Epidicus* needs both entrances, but neither can be located exactly. From the position of the houses, however, one concludes that the two entrances cannot coincide. There are on the stage three houses, belonging respectively to Periphanes, Chaeribulus, and Apocides. Their position is determined by the following analysis: At vs. 181 *Epidicus* enters from the house of Chaeribulus, and seeing Periphanes and Apocides before the latter's house hurries past, as though not seeing them, in order to find Periphanes at his house. The two do not see him until he has passed them, and they believe his tale of having come from the forum. This means that the house of Chaeribulus is near the entrance *a foro*, that of Apocides next it, and that of Periphanes third in order. Now the house of Chaeribulus, by the entrance *a foro*, is the goal of Stratipocles and Chaeribulus, who at vs. 102 enter *a portu* and pass *Epidicus*, who is hiding in an *angiportum*. When they pass him they must have passed at least one house—that of Periphanes; so that since the house of Chaeribulus, by the entrance *a foro*, is farthest from the house of Periphanes, near the entrance *a portu*, the two entrances must face each other.

Menaechmi is very important for determining the position of the two entrances. Because of the confusion motif, all entrances and exits must be manipulated carefully.

At vs. 225 Cylindrus, Erotium's cook, goes *ad forum* to fetch provisions for the dinner to be given for *Menaechmus I*. At vs. 226 *Menaechmus II* enters *a peregre*. If his entrance and the cook's exit take place at the same end of the stage, Cylindrus must note the presence of *Menaechmus II*, but Cylindrus on his return (vs. 273) is astonished at seeing *Menaechmus II* on the scene. He had not, then, seen him before. The exit *ad forum*, therefore, cannot coincide with the entrance *a peregre*—unless there be a pause after vs. 225 (end of Act I).

At vs. 445 Messenio departs *in tabernam deuorsoriam* (vs. 436). This expression indicates use of the exit *peregre*; see vs. 1050, where *Menaechmus II*, who at vs. 881 had gone *ad nauem*, returns with

Messenio, who at vs. 1038 had gone *in tabernam deuorsoriam*. At vs. 466 Menaechmus II enters from Erotium's house. In an effort to escape from the turmoil caused by his presence he resorts to trickery—"Demam hanc coronam atque abiciam ad laeuam manum." As he speaks (vs. 555) he is, of necessity, facing the audience, whether directly or obliquely, so that his left is the spectator's right. Having flung the wreath to the spectator's right, he departs to the spectator's left to find Messenio. Thus the exit *peregre* is on the spectator's left.

At vss. 559 ff. Peniculus and the wife of Menaechmus I enter from the house of Menaechmus I, see the wreath lying in the street, and, picking up the false clue, turn and see coming toward them Menaechmus I, who is returning *a foro* (cf. vs. 599). Thus the entrance *a foro* is on the spectator's right.

At vs. 700 Menaechmus I, locked out of his home by his irate spouse, goes forumward to get advice on his next move. At vs. 701 Menaechmus II enters (*a peregre*). The two do not meet. Therefore, unless there is a pause after vs. 700 (end of Act IV), they do not use the same side of the stage.

Vss. 701 ff. are sometimes offered as refutation of the theory of opposed entrances. In reality, they are not refutation. Menaechmus II is upbraided by the wife of Menaechmus I, who in desperation produces her father to prove her supposed husband a liar. The old man enters *a foro*. His daughter cries to Menaechmus II, "Quin respicis? Nouisti tu illum?" indicating that Menaechmus II must turn about in order to see the newcomer. This, however, does not mean that, since the old man has come *a foro*, and since Menaechmus II must turn to see him, therefore Menaechmus II had come *a foro*. One must indeed allow even a Plautine actor liberty to turn his back; and any man, falling under the reproaches of such a shrew, would undoubtedly turn in order to remove her from his sight—if he could not get away from the sound of her tongue. So that if the passage shows anything, it is that Menaechmus II had entered by the side opposite the entrance *a foro*, had turned, and at vs. 747 was facing his own place of entrance. This is the more probable because at vs. 706 Menaechmus II, anxious for the return of Messenio, who must come *a portu*,¹ would naturally watch that entrance. The two entrances must face each other.

¹ See remarks on vs. 445.

At vs. 881 Menaechmus II goes *ad nauem*, seizing his opportunity when the old man has gone *ad forum* to seek a doctor. The old man returns at vs. 882, unaware of the departure of Menaechmus II, and thinks that Menaechmus I, who enters *a foro* at vs. 899, is the man who has been acting so strangely.

Cumulative evidence proves that the entrance *a foro* cannot coincide with that *a portu*. The entrance *a foro* lies to the spectator's right; that *a portu* to the spectator's left. Throughout the play the two strangers (Menaechmus II and Messenio) use the entrance *a peregre*; the inhabitants of Ephesus use always the local entrance. Thus, despite the confusion motif, the audience is never in doubt as to the identity of either brother.

In *Mercator*, at vs. 175 Charinus chides his slave, who he says entered *a portu* (vs. 110), for running after him *per urbem*. This seems to indicate that for this play city and harbor lay off the same end of the stage. However, if the slave leaves the harbor to find his master, he must go *per urbem*, at least through part of it.¹ He is not reproached with running *per forum*; but unless one juggles with words one must admit that this passage gives support to the tradition of Pollux.

Vss. 874 ff., however, defy this inference. To understand the passage we must locate the houses on the stage. There are two—one for Lysimachus and one for Demipho. The first is located from vss. 466 and 474. At vs. 466 Demipho goes *ad portum*, forbidding Charinus to follow him. Charinus determines to seek a doctor, that he may take poison. He is, therefore, about to go *ad forum*, when, at vs. 474, he is called back by Eutyclus, who enters from the house of Lysimachus. This house, then, is near the exit *ad forum*. From the other house, at vs. 830, Charinus enters. "Ab Atticis abhorreo," he says, and is about to start off *peregre*, when, at vs. 864, his voice is heard by Eutyclus, who had entered from the house of Lysimachus at vs. 842. The house of Demipho is then by the exit *peregre*.

In any event, when Eutyclus calls after Charinus the latter must be on the other side of the stage. Otherwise, he would have been discovered before the lapse of twenty-three verses. Charinus'

¹ Also he has not appeared before, and can therefore say that he has been all over town without disturbing the convention. Charinus (vss. 109-10) may mean only, "How do you happen to be so far away from the harbor where I ordered you to stay?"

position is close by the exit *peregre*, so that in Eutyclus' pleading to turn from his proposed journey, *huc* means "home," *illuc* means *peregre*, "abroad." All disadvantages Eutyclus puts *illuc*, all advantages *huc*. "Nubis ater imberque instat . . . ad sinisteram"; all this is *illuc-peregre*. If one could determine the viewpoint from which at vs. 879 *ad sinisteram* is *peregre*, one could locate the exit *peregre*. Unfortunately the text gives no further clue. But the cumulative evidence of vss. 474 and 879, outweighing that offered by vs. 175, proves that the two exits cannot coincide.

A third passage indicates that on occasion one might go *ad portum* by another way than the disputed wing-exit. At vs. 224 Charinus and Acanthio leave the stage. At vs. 219, to Charinus' wish to go *ad portum* Acanthio had objected, "si istac abis, commodum obuiam uenies patri." Charinus replied, "hac ibo potius." They do not, then, use the door by which Demipho at vs. 225 enters *a portu*; for in that event, unless time elapses between vs. 224 and vs. 225, Charinus could not avoid meeting his father. He does not meet him until vs. 365, when he has returned *a portu* (see vs. 328). This is the only passage (except *Persa* vs. 678) found which suggests the use of the *angiportum* as a way to the harbor.¹

In *Miles gloriosus*, at vs. 1284, Pleusicles, in sailor's dress, enters. To deceive the Miles he comes *a portu* (vs. 1181). That he does not come from a house on the stage is proved by vs. 1196, and by the remark of the Miles (vss. 1281-82) which heralds his approach, "nescioquis eccum incedit | ornatu quidem thalassico." As Pleusicles enters he is relatively distant from the Miles' house, for he does not see the Miles until vs. 1290. The house of the Miles, who at vs. 1284 is before his own door, is, then, not by the entrance *a portu*.

The other house on the stage, that of Palaestrio, directly adjoins the first house (see vs. 142), and is not by the entrance *a foro*; see vs. 946, where Periplectomenus and Acroteleutium go into this house as the Miles enters at vs. 947 *a foro*—unless there be a pause for act division.

The relative positions of the houses may be fixed from vss. 361 and 1216. At vs. 361 Sceledrus, determined not to let the girl get out of the neighbor's house, stands facing the door, with arms out-

¹ For further discussion of the *angiportum* and its uses, see p. 430 and note.

stretched across it, and as he so stands is bidden to look *ad laeuam*, to his master's door and see the girl outside. From a certain point of view, then, the house of the Miles is to the left of the neighbor's. At vs. 1216, as Acroteleutium and Melphidippa enter from Palaestrio's house the Miles, before his own door, is *ad laeuam*, that is, on the actor's left and the spectator's right. The Brix-Niemeyer third edition of the *Miles* (1901) reconciles vss. 361 and 1216 by the suggestion that at vs. 361 Sceledrus wheels in surprise—"quam ob rem?"—and is therefore facing the audience at *respice dum ad laeuam*; so that the house of the Miles is at the spectator's right from that of Palaestrio.

If, then, the house of the Miles, distant from the exit *peregre*, is on the spectator's right from the neighbor's house, a *foro* is on the spectator's right and a *peregre* on the spectator's left.

Mostellaria needs three entrances, a *foro*, a *peregre*, and *rure*; but they cannot be located, except the last, which may be reached by the *angiportum*; see p. 430 and note.

In *Persa*, at vs. 329 Saturio with the *virgo* enters a *foro* (vs. 160). Although the girl is dressed for her part in the trick, the two do not come a *peregre*, for Saturio is not an active participant in the plot. As they enter, the stage is empty and they enter the house at vs. 399 unobserved. At vs. 462 Sagaristio and this girl come from the house and go out (vs. 469) to hide *e conspectu*. At vs. 470 Dordalus, victim of the plot, enters a *foro*. He does not see Sagaristio and his companion. Therefore they did not depart by the exit *ad forum*. They cannot go far, because they must keep near enough to the characters on the stage to get their cue, "*ubi cum lenone me uidebis conloqui, id erit adeundi tempus*;" and when they do return, they come a *peregre*, being seen in the distance before they are near enough to be accosted. This last detail excludes the possibility of their hiding in the *angiportum*. They must at vs. 469 have gone out of the door *ad portum*; and that must be opposite the entrance a *foro*.

A second passage confirms this conclusion. At vs. 676 Toxilus says to Sagaristio, "*ubi argentum ab hoc acceperis | simulato quasi eas prorsum in nauem— | per angiportum rursum te ad me recipito | illac per hortum*." At vs. 692 Sagaristio starts off with the money, but Toxilus cries, "*quid properas?*" Sagaristio replies that he

desires to buy the freedom of his brother, who is a slave in these parts, and ends, "animus iam in nauist mihi." This, I take it, does not mean that the way to the harbor lies through the forum, and so that forum and harbor lie off the same end of the stage. Toxilus' excited question indicates that Sagaristio is starting off in an unexpected direction, not *in nauem*, according to instructions, but the other way, *ad forum*, as if forgetting his part; and Sagaristio's last remark is by way of a broad wink, to indicate that he is improving on the original trick. Such liberty is in keeping with the character of the slave in Roman Comedy. In this play the two exits cannot coincide.

In *Poenulus*, at vs. 504 Agorastocles with witnesses enters *a foro*. These witnesses are not keen on the business in hand. On the contrary, they are only too eager to depart, and to facilitate their departure they stay near the place of entrance, until at Agorastocles' bidding (vs. 582) they unwillingly draw a bit nearer his house, so that at vs. 707 they can call him out without disturbing the community. They bid him *specta ad dexteram* to the house of Lycus. As Agorastocles stands in the doorway his right is at the spectator's left. That is, the house of Lycus is at the spectator's left; that of Agorastocles, near the entrance *a foro*, is on the spectator's right.¹ Therefore the entrance *a foro* is at the spectator's right.

At vs. 930 Hanno enters *a peregre*. At vs. 961 he sees Agorastocles and Milphio enter from the former's house and resolves to speak to them. He is, however, not near enough to do so until vs. 975. He must, therefore, have entered at the spectator's left. Therefore the entrance *a peregre* is at the spectator's left.

In *Pseudolus*, at vs. 594 Harpax enters *a peregre*. At vs. 597 he counts Ballio's house as seventh from the city gate. Now this same house stands on the forum side of the stage, as is seen from the following analysis: At the beginning of the play Calidorus with his slave, Pseudolus, enters from his house, lamenting Ballio's cruelty. Ballio enters from his own house, and at vs. 241 is about to go *ad forum* (vs. 163), when Calidorus bids Pseudolus call the *leno* back before it is too late. Ballio has not seen the two and does not see

¹ The temple of Venus stands between the two houses; see vs. 1212, where the girls, going from the temple to the house of Lycus, are called back by Agorastocles.

them until he turns. He has, then, been about to go out by the exit near his house. That is, the way *ad forum* lies near the *leno's* house, which house, as has been said, is seventh from the city gate.

At vs. 905 Pseudolus, followed by Simia, enters a *foro*. Simia is to pretend to be Harpax, in order to get the money from the *leno*. He must therefore pretend to come a *peregre*. Pseudolus coaches him for his part. *Tertium hoc est*, vs. 952, refers to Ballio's house. "This is the third house, third from the side by which you are supposed to enter." That side, as has been said, leads *peregre*, i.e., one coming a *peregre* comes the way opposite that taken by Pseudolus and Simia. The entrance a *peregre* is opposite that a *foro*.

In *Rudens*, at vs. 856, *in urbem ire ad portum* locates city and harbor off the same side of the stage; and by those who accept the Vitruvian tradition, the play is, accordingly, noted as an exception to the general rule for exits as well as to that of scene.

But before agreeing that it is an exception, one should remember that in plays previously considered the forum is the place to which one goes for all purposes of local interest. *Forum* is a synonym for all things near at hand, as opposed to those that are foreign (*peregre*). *Forum* is not used in this passage, and nowhere in the plays, except possibly in *Mercator* vs. 175, is it a synonym for *urbs*. Consider the scene: a deserted bit of seashore, whose sole inhabitants are an exile from Athens and a priestess who tends the shrine of Venus, a Grace Darling of long ago in her 'long-shore lighthouse. Once in a while a few half-starved fishermen may appear, but that is all. From the viewpoint of such desolation, a city, a forum, a harbor, any place where crowds of people congregate, is far remote—*peregre*. That which for this region takes the place of *forum* as a synonym for local activities is the water's edge, the *beach*.

The sea is visible in part and lies off one end of the stage. This end is that farther from the *uilla*; for at vs. 253, as the girls enter, they see, as they advance, first the shrine *ad dextram*, but the *uilla* they do not see. Now if, as they advance, any building is *ad dextram*, they must enter from the spectator's right, otherwise *ad dextram* is out in the audience. Therefore the beach is at the spectator's right. The *uilla* is near the entrance a *peregre*; for at vs. 89 Plesidippus and his friends, entering from the city, overhear Sceparnio, as

he mutters to himself outside his master's door. Therefore the entrance *a peregre*, from the distant city, is at the spectator's left.

Two other passages corroborate the location of the entrance from the beach at the spectator's right. At vss. 155-56, Daemones, standing before his door, sees two people struggling in the surf *ad dextram (viden) secundum litus*. If we suppose him standing on the spectator's right, and looking across to the other side of the stage—his language indicates that he is looking at something at a distance—there is no point to his regret that one of the unfortunates has gone *dextrouorsum auorsam in malam crucem* (vs. 176). If, however, Daemones stands at the spectator's right, the situation is different. The whole point to the passage is that the audience does not and cannot see the actual happening. If Daemones' position be that indicated by the first possibility, and if the girl be carried gradually *ad dextram*, necessarily she will in time come in sight of the audience; if the arrangement be that of the second possibility, there is no straining of the illusion on learning that the girl is being carried *ad dextram*.

The beach lies to the spectator's right. The play falls in line with the Vitruvian tradition of the opposition of local and foreign entrances.

In *Stichus*, Antipho, at vs. 145, goes *ad forum*, anxious that his reluctant daughters marry again. At vs. 402 Epignomus, one of the missing sons-in-law, enters *a peregre*, and enters his house. At vs. 505 Antipho returns with Pamphilippus, the other son-in-law, who has suddenly returned to Athens. Therefore, although Antipho should return *a foro*, he apparently comes *a peregre*. He cannot meet Pamphilippus on the stage, for no greetings are exchanged, and already they seem to have come to an agreement. As they talk, Epignomus enters from his house, and greets them. Antipho admits having already seen Epignomus—but where?

From the material at hand one gathers that if Antipho, having gone *ad forum*, returns *a portu*, the two entrances must coincide. There is, however, such confusion of plot as to give evidence of *retractatio*, so that one feels not quite confident of the value of the internal evidence.¹

¹ Cf. Cornelia C. Coulter, *Retractatio in the Ambrosian and Palatine Recensions of Plautus*, 1911, pp. 83-96, where the difficulties in the *Stichus* are fully discussed.

In *Trinummus*, at vs. 819 Megaronides goes *ad forum* to get the sharper (vs. 815). At vs. 820 his future victim, Charmides, enters *a peregre*. The two do not meet. Therefore, unless there be a pause after vs. 819, end of Act III, the two entrances cannot coincide.

Truculentus needs entrances *a foro*, *rure*, and *a portu*, but affords no certain evidence for their location.

Vidularia is too fragmentary to supply evidence.

In *Adelphoe*,¹ at vs. 154 Micio goes *ad forum*. At vs. 155, the beginning of Act II, Aeschinus and the girl and slaves, followed by Sannio, enter from the *leno's* house, which is not on the stage. If they enter *a foro*, only a pause in the action will obviate the meeting of the father and son, who at vs. 637 are much surprised at encountering each other. Spengel, ed. 1905, suggests that the *leno's* house is on the harbor side, as today such places are situated for the convenience of seamen. Moreover, in the harbor district the rape of the girl could probably be accomplished more easily than in the city proper. Spengel's hypothesis assures the opposition of the two entrances.

In *Andria*, at vs. 725 Mysis lays the child at Simo's door. Davus had planned to inform Simo of its presence, but changes his mind when at vs. 732 he sees Chremes coming. "I'll pretend," says he, "to come the same way—from the right." Chremes is coming from his house, which is not on the stage (see vss. 594 and 740). He enters, therefore, *a foro*. *A foro* is on the right—but is it the spectator's or the actor's right? Stage business helps to answer this question. As Davus, watching Mysis and the child, is at the same time keeping a sharp lookout, he must stand with his back more or less to the audience; for he has to watch the house doors and the wings. Therefore his viewpoint coincides with the spectator's. *A foro* is on the spectator's right.

The entrance *a peregre* may be located after fixing the position of the houses. For this play only two houses are needed, one for Simo and one for Glycerium. Simo's house is by the entrance *a peregre*, for at vs. 800, as Davus and Mysis stand before Simo's door a stranger enters and asks the way to the house of Glycerium. At vs. 734 Chremes enters *a foro*, bound for the house of Simo. Davus

¹ Citations from Dziatzko's text.

slips into the *angiportum*, and when Chremes has passed comes out behind him, pretending that he, too, has come *a foro*. This means that Chremes has passed a house (Glycerium's) which must be relatively near the entrance *a foro*. Since the entrance *a foro* is at the spectator's right, that *a peregre* must be at the spectator's left.

In *Heauton Timoroumenos*, the scene is laid in the country. Except three entrances—(1) vs. 242, where the slaves enter from the city, which, for this play, lies *peregre*,¹ followed by (2) vs. 381, the two women; (3) vs. 805, where Clitipho returns from a walk (see vs. 586) and so by the local entrance—all entrances and exits are respectively from and to houses on the stage. The two fixed entrances are not located, but here, as in the other plays, one leads from foreign parts and one from places near by.

Hecyra needs two entrances, *a foro* and *a Peiraeo*, but neither can be fixed, although vss. 431 ff., where Parmeno returns *a portu*, and Pamphilus, to get him out of the way, sends him to the *arx*, that is, in the opposite direction, indicate that the two entrances cannot coincide.

In *Eunuchus*, at vs. 538 Chremes goes *ad forum*. At vs. 539 Antipho enters *a portu*. The two should not meet; therefore unless there be a pause for act-division the exit *peregre* is opposite that *ad forum*.

At vs. 614 Antipho and Chaerea go to Antipho's house, which is not on the stage. They go, then, *ad forum*. Thence, at vs. 839, Antipho returns. Pythias, meanwhile, standing before the house of Thais, cries, "Here comes the very man *ad sinisteram*." There is nothing to warrant her facing away from the audience so that her left is the spectator's right. Thus the entrance *a foro* is at the spectator's right.

In *Phormio*, at vs. 152 Geta goes *ad portum*. At vs. 153 Antipho and Phaedria enter *a foro*.² Geta evidently does not meet them, for on his return (vs. 179) he is at a loss to find Antipho. The two entrances cannot coincide. Having met the young men Geta warns

¹ See on the *Rudens*, p. 425. So Mr. Kelley Rees, *op. cit.*, 402—unintentionally true—"the highway leads in one direction to the city (and harbor), in the other into the country."

² Or from Chremes' house; so Hauler, *Anh.*, p. 229, on vs. 152, because of vs. 195, *reuocemus hominem*.

them of Demipho's return. At vs. 215 Demipho is seen, whereupon, at vs. 218, Antipho, unable to face his father, rushes away. Obviously, he goes in the opposite direction. At vs. 309 Phaedria pretends to go after him *ad forum*, and makes his way toward that quarter, even though in reality he enters the *leno's* house. The two entrances cannot coincide.

At vs. 462 Demipho goes *ad portum*; at vs. 465 Antipho, still dodging him, enters *a foro*. This again necessitates the opposition of the two entrances. So also vs. 566, end of Act III, where Geta and Phaedria go *ad forum*, for the next line, vs. 567, brings Demipho and Chremes *a portu*. For this play the two entrances must face each other.

From the twenty-one plays of Plautus and the six of Terence, therefore, we gain the following data for the location of the fixed entrances:

One play is too fragmentary to be useful: *Vidularia*.

One is too confused to be useful: *Stichus*.

Two plays need only the exit *ad forum*, and that is not located: *Casina*, *Cistellaria*.

Three plays need both entrances, but fail to locate them: *Mostellaria*, *Truculentus*, *Heauton Timoroumenos*.

Four plays afford some evidence for placing forum and harbor off the same end of the stage: *Mercator*, vs. 175, counteracted by vs. 466; *Persa*, vs. 678, counteracted by vss. 469-70; *Rudens*, vs. 856, counteracted by vss. 89, 253 ff.; *Stichus*, vss. 145 and 538, but the play has suffered *retractatio*.

Twenty plays demand the opposition of local and foreign exits: *Amphitruo*, *Asinaria*, *Aulularia*, *Bacchides*, *Captivi*, *Curculio*, *Epidicus*, *Menaechmi*, *Mercator*, *Miles gloriosus*, *Persa*, *Poenulus*, *Pseudolus*, *Rudens*, *Trinummus*, *Adelphoe*, *Andria*, *Hecyra*, *Eunuchus*, *Phormio*. Eight of these plays definitely locate one or both of the entrances. The *Amphitruo* locates the entrance *a portu* on the spectator's left, that *a foro* opposite. The *Eunuchus* locates the local entrance on the spectator's right, *a portu* opposite. The *Curculio*, *Menaechmi*, *Miles gloriosus*, *Poenulus*, *Rudens*, *Andria* place the local entrance on the spectator's right, the entrance *a peregre* on the spectator's left.

We have, then, a total of twenty plays out of twenty-six vindicating the Vitruvian tradition—*una a foro, altera a peregre*—to which partial statement we add that the first entrance is on the spectator's right, the second on the spectator's left.¹

THE EXIT *rus*

There are but three ways² to leave the Roman stage, *ad forum* (spectator's right), *ad portum* (spectator's left), and *per angiportum*. The *angiportum*³ is used as a back way *ad forum*: *Mostellaria*, vss. 1, 932; *Persa*, vs. 444; *Cistellaria*, vs. 124; *Pseudolus*, vs. 1235.

Seven passages avail to determine which of these three exits is used by characters going *rus*.

Adelphoe, vs. 81: Demea, *homo agrestis*, enters *rure*. On his way he has heard of his son's capers. He has therefore encountered gossips; he has been in the city. Therefore he enters *a foro*. His dress is sufficient to distinguish him from such urban characters as enter *a foro*.

Adelphoe, vs. 438: Demea about to go *rus* sees *procul* Hegio and Geta coming *a foro*.

Capitivi, vss. 750 ff.: Tyndarus is led to the quarries (*rus*) by way of the forum.

Capitivi, vs. 997: see pp. 417–18, for the return of Tyndarus.

Eunuchus, vs. 224: Phaedria goes *rus*. At vs. 232 Gnatho enters *a peregre*. The two may not meet; but possibly the lapse of time between the verses would not permit the assertion that the exits *rus* and *peregre* cannot coincide.

Truculentus, vs. 645: Strabax enters *rure* and goes into the house of Astaphium. At vs. 669 Truculentus enters *a foro* (vs. 314), marveling that Strabax has not come *rure*. Apparently, he had expected to come upon him in the forum, on his way *rure*. Strabax, then, entered *a foro*.

Mostellaria, vss. 66 ff.: Tranio bids Grumio, *homo agrestis*, "Tace atque abi rus . . . ego ire in Peiraeum uolo . . . i rus,

¹ Perhaps the order of the words in Vitruvius gives a hint to verify this conclusion, *dextra ac sinistra . . . una a foro, altera a peregre*.

² Always excepting the house-doors; for use of the house-doors see above, p. 414, note.

³ For discussion of the uses of the *angiportum*, see A. Mueller, *op. cit.*, pp. 15 ff.

te amoue, ne tu hercle praeterhac mihi non facies moram." The unmistakable inference from all this is that when going *rus* one does not go *ad portum*. Otherwise Tranio might allow Grumio to accompany him to the Peiraeus instead of plainly telling him to stop being a nuisance and to go the other way. Besides, as Tranio goes out, Grumio makes no effort to follow, but laments "satin abiit nunc rus abibo."

However, when Grumio does go *rus* (vs. 83), it is to avoid meeting his master Philolaches, who enters *a foro* at vs. 84. Grumio cannot, then, depart by the normal exit *ad forum*. But we have already noted that the *angiportum* at crises offers a back way *ad forum*; and it is through it that Grumio makes his escape. This would perhaps explain why, when the play opens, Grumio is already at the kitchen door. If that door opened on the *angiportum*, as is likely, a few steps from behind the scene would bring him to the door, whereas if he enters from right or left, he must cover a long distance before the dialogue begins. So likewise Tranio at vs. 932 goes *per posticum*, announcing that he is going *rus*.

Rus, then, is reached, not by the exit *peregre*,¹ but by one of the exits *ad forum*, either the right wing or the *angiportum*. The balance of evidence is in favor of the right wing; but for the most part the difference is immaterial. A real *homo agrestis* is always labeled by his dress, and, furthermore, all persons going *rus* or coming *rure* announce the fact, so that no confusion is possible.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

¹ Except possibly in plays needing no real *peregre* entrance; see p. 417, note.

CICERO AND BITHYNICUS

BY ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL

In the collection of Cicero's miscellaneous correspondence (*Ad Familiares*) stand in immediate conjunction two undated letters (vi. 16, 17) of which the former is addressed simply *Bithynicus Ciceroni S.*, and the latter *Cicero Bithynico S.* The somewhat formal tone of the letter from Bithynicus suggests that perhaps the address is not preserved in its original shape; but this point is not of value for the present discussion. In *Fam.* xvi. 23. 1 Cicero remarks to Tiro, *ad Bithynicum scripsi*, but as an isolated sentence, and without anything in the context to suggest the theme of his letter. These three are the only places in the entire body of Cicero's correspondence where the name Bithynicus is to be found.

The placing of the two letters vi. 16 and 17 in this order suggests, in the absence of any other extant correspondence between the two men, that the ancient editor of Cicero's epistles in the form in which we now have them took the second to be an answer to the first, and that has been the judgment also of recent scholars in considerable numbers, including such men as Professors Tyrrell and Purser and O. E. Schmidt. The collocation of the two Bithynicus letters immediately after the brief letter to Basilus (vi. 15), which I have discussed already in this journal (*Class. Phil.*, VIII, 48 ff.), further suggests that the ancient editor may have believed the Bithynicus concerned to be the man of that name probably nominated by Julius Caesar before his death to be governor of Sicily in 44 B.C., and the (undated) letters to have been written by and to Bithynicus in that province not long after the fatal Ides of March, to which day the editor doubtless referred the Basilus letter. This also has been a common opinion in recent times, though some critics have hesitated to make any definite affirmation about the date, even when they were certain that the second letter was in answer to the first.

Two men called Bithynicus are the only persons of that surname known to us who may or must have been known to Cicero. One of

[CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY X, October, 1915] 432

these is mentioned by Cicero himself (*Brut.* 240) as a somewhat older friend of his student days. His full name is given by Cicero as *Q. Pompeius A. f., qui Bithynicus dictus est*. The cognomen, which Cicero's phrase would imply was a new one, he appears to have acquired by services in connection with the organization of the province of Bithynia in 75 B.C.¹ He took the side of Pompey in the civil war, fled with him to Egypt, and was there killed in the year 48.² That is practically all that is known about him.

Of the second Bithynicus even less is told. In 43-42 a Pompeius Bithynicus was governor of Sicily, where he was put to death by Sextus Pompey.³ It is justifiably enough assumed that he was the son of the other Pompeius Bithynicus, dead six years earlier. It is less surely, but with some degree of plausibility, assumed that his governorship began in 44 by the *ante mortem* appointment of Caesar and that accordingly he was in Sicily either from some little time before Caesar's death, or, at any rate, from a time shortly thereafter. This, to be sure, corresponds with a longer term of office than the single year then allowed by law for praetorian provinces; but (1) no other incumbent or claimant of the post for the year 44 is known, (2) the selection of provincial governors for 43 (M. Cusinius for Sicily) presided over by Antony was a month later (December, 44) declared null and void by the senate and the present incumbents ordered to remain in command; and therefore, as Bithynicus was at least *locum tenens* at the end of 43 and the beginning of 42, it is but reasonable to suppose him a hold-over appointee of Caesar for 44 (cf. W. Sternkopf in *Hermes*, XLVII, 328). Even this is much grist for little meal.

The circumstances are favorable to the view that Cicero might have had correspondence with either of these two men. For further determinations we must turn to the letters themselves. Bithynicus in addressing Cicero claims an interest in his friendship based upon Cicero's intimacy with his father. Of his own previous relations to Cicero he speaks with an indefiniteness that appears to be the expression of modest politeness. All this does not seem natural

¹ Liv. *Per.* xciii; Eutrop. vi. 6; Fest. 320 L. s. u. *rutrum ten. iun.*

² Oros. vi. 15. 28.

³ Dio xlviii. 17. 4; 19. 1; App. iv. 84; v. 70; Liv. *Per.* cxxiii.

if addressed to a somewhat younger former schoolmate. But it is perfectly proper from a younger man to his father's old friend. Surely no one reading the two letters independently, the one of the other, and without prejudice, could fail to perceive that the tone of the first is that of a junior recommending himself to a senior, that of the second, of a senior meeting with reminiscent kindness the advances of a junior. Thus the elder of the two Bithynici appears to be eliminated. It is the younger who writes to Cicero, and is answered by him.

But in spite of the view generally taken (and taken, I suspect, by the ancient editor), Cicero's letter is very evidently not an answer to the extant letter from Bithynicus. Suppose we had preserved to us only the letter of Cicero: what could we reasonably infer from it concerning the utterances of the letter from Bithynicus to which it is evidently a reply? Bithynicus must have expressed sorrow over the unsettled political conditions of the time, and hope that they might speedily be happily adjusted, so that when he was able to return to Rome he might cultivate more fully those relations of intimate friendship with Cicero which he had to some extent previously enjoyed. And as to the circumstances of the letter, Cicero recognizes that the political friends of Bithynicus, and not his own, are in power, and from them Bithynicus may confidently look for favors, while Cicero himself can only assure him of the continuance of his warm personal regard, for his father's sake and his own. At one point we might be sure that Cicero is quoting the actual words of his correspondent, *promissum tuum, quo in litteris uteris; scribis enim, si ita sit, te mecum esse uicturum*. It is not certain, on the other hand, that Bithynicus made reference to his father's friendship with Cicero. That remark may as naturally have originated with Cicero himself.

Now when we turn to the extant letter of Bithynicus, it is evident at first sight that it in no way corresponds in sentiment to the outline reconstructed above, except that the writer refers to his father's friendship with Cicero. That is actually the only point of apparent connection between the two epistles textually before us (for *me tueare* of the first letter can have no possible reference to a state of things when the friends of Bithynicus, as the second letter indicates, are in power). I have no doubt that this point alone prompted the

thought that Cicero's single letter to Bithynicus must have been an answer to the single letter from him. But notice especially that there is nothing at all in the actual phrases of Bithynicus pointing to the phrase quoted verbally by Cicero from him (*scribis enim, si ita sit* [that is, if political troubles should subside], *te mecum esse uicturum*). Cicero's letter clearly indicates that this was the main point in the missive that he was answering. For it the letter of Bithynicus must have been written. But his extant letter makes no such proffer of desire for more perfect intimacy: it merely refers modestly to the friendship for Cicero of the writer and his father as the basis for asking Cicero *ut absentem me, quibuscumque in rebus opus fuerit, tueare*. That is evidently the purpose for which this letter was written. It appears by its tone and manner of expression to be addressed to a person who had not been previously a correspondent and was not even on terms of active present friendship with the writer. But the second letter assumes a certain familiarity already established, which Bithynicus could, with the proper deference to an older and more distinguished man, express a desire to increase (cf. *inter alia* Cicero in answer to Fadius Gallus—*Fam. vii. 23. 4: est mihi gratissimum . . . ut eam domum sumeres, ut non modo prope me, sed plane mecum habitare posses*; and of the Stoic Diodotus—*Brut. 309: qui cum habitauisset apud me mecumque uixisset, nuper est domi meae mortuus*). Again, at the time the first letter is written, Cicero may be regarded as having influence with the powers that be: at the date of the second letter he has none at all, but the friends of Bithynicus, who are not his, are in the saddle.

There is accordingly no good reason for connecting the two letters intimately, but on the contrary quite unsurmountable obstacles in the way of that disposition of them. They must be considered as quite distinct in time and setting. To what period, then, are we to assign each?

The letter of Bithynicus appears to have been written when he had no standing of especial intimacy with Cicero, but would commend himself to his kind consideration. What the *officia* were which Bithynicus pleads as a basis for claiming (though he does it with great deference) the exercise of Cicero's friendship in the future, we cannot tell. Outside of these two letters and the three words in

Fam. xvi. 23. 1 nothing is known concerning the relations between Cicero and the younger Bithynicus. The tone of the letter suggests that their friendship must earlier have been of the slightest, and there had been a considerable period of cessation of all intercourse, so that Bithynicus appears to feel that he almost needs to introduce himself to Cicero's memory. The elder Bithynicus, Cicero's boyhood friend, had accompanied Pompey on his disastrous Thessalian campaign, and it is quite reasonable to guess that the *officia* now recalled to Cicero's mind may have been performed when Cicero was in Pompey's camp at Dyrrachium. The younger Bithynicus would certainly be of military age, his father, on Cicero's estimate, being about sixty years old in 48, and the son competent to hold a praetorian province in 44. I imagine that the letter was written after the father's tragic death, and some considerable time afterward, when Caesar had returned to Italy, Cicero had concluded those long months of anxious waiting at Brundisium and was established at home in a dignified and not unhonored retirement, and the younger Bithynicus, who had prolonged the conflict against Caesar, was lingering outside of Italy, but ready and desirous to return and take up the thread of life under the new ruler. I am therefore inclined to think that his words *ut absentem me, quibuscumque in rebus opus fuerit, tueare* have a more specific meaning here than they would elsewhere necessarily carry. Bithynicus may very well have in mind the possibility of securing from his father's friend, with whom he had held no communication since they parted at Dyrrachium two years before, an effective word in his behalf with Caesar, who had shown himself considerate and generous toward Cicero. The letter of Bithynicus might with considerable probability be assigned to the second half of the year 46, when Caesar was back in Rome between the African and Spanish campaigns, and was setting on foot the new administration, besides pardoning his former enemies right and left. That the younger Bithynicus, who I assume had been a Pompeian like his father, appears in 44 as Caesar's nominee for the governorship of Sicily, and so had presumably been praetor in 45, or perhaps several years earlier, is of course not surprising. Some other Pompeians fared as well from Caesar's magnanimity. At any rate Bithynicus did not murder his benefactor.

The circumstances of Cicero's letter to Bithynicus are, as I have pointed out above, distinctly different. The state is in a parlous condition, being in the hands of people who are ambitiously exploiting it for their own advantage. They are the political friends of Bithynicus, and hence Cicero speaks with some reserve about the condition of things, but intimates his own powerlessness. This fits only the period after Antony had succeeded in establishing himself at the helm of affairs, and Cicero, following the lead of his friends, M. Brutus and Cassius, had, at least for the time, given up the unequal struggle. I am inclined to assign the letter to the end of May or the month of June in the year 44. And I further think it quite likely, though it is by no means certain, that the remark *ad Bithynicum scripsi* in *Fam.* xvi. 23. 1 refers to this particular letter. The letter itself sounds as if Cicero and Bithynicus had not recently been in active correspondence, and that, if a fact, would readily explain why Cicero in a letter to Tiro interpolates a brief remark that he has answered the (no longer extant) letter just received from the governor of Sicily. I would attempt to date Cicero's answer to Bithynicus more precisely, but that would involve, according to my view, the necessity of discussing the controverted date of the letter to Tiro mentioned above, and upon that question I am disinclined to enter at the present moment.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
November, 1914

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE HOMERIC CAESURA AS AN AID TO INTERPRETATION

Professor Seymour in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, III (1892), 91 ff., set forth with emphasis and in great detail the importance of the caesura in determining the meaning of the poet; drawing this conclusion: "The true construction is often indicated by the pause in the third foot. The caesura is in many cases the most immediate clue that the verse affords to the construction." Professor Clark in *CJ*, IX, 61 ff., has added to the arguments of Professor Seymour by a special study of "Caesural Emphasis in the *Iliad*."

One is pleased to feel that in reading or hearing such a verse as γ 273: πολλὰ δὲ μηρί' ἔκηε θεῶν ἱεροῖς ἐπὶ βωμοῖς, the reader or hearer would not have connected μηρί' with θεῶν, but by the very force of the caesura would instinctively have waited for the word which is to be limited by the genitive. In this verse the caesura seems most helpful, so likewise in the following: λ 341: κτήματ' ἐνὶ μεγάροισι θεῶν ἰότητι κέονται, where again it seems that the caesura saved the hearer from a possible ambiguity. There are other similar examples of the apparent exegetical value of the caesura, but many are not so simple, e. g., Agamemnon slew Iphidamas and having stripped him of his weapons bore them in triumph through the throng of the Greeks: Δ 247: βῆ δὲ φέρων ἄν' ὄμιλον Ἀχαιῶν τεύχεα καλά. Here the caesura as an exegetical indication must be ignored, or the effect of the verse is ruined.

In the preparation of this paper the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* have been read, practically all aloud, with the idea of observing the caesura and of proving how much assistance it might render in indicating the construction of the verse. The material is so vast that examples will be selected from the *Odyssey* only. In eight of the ten verses forming the introduction to the *Odyssey* the word before the caesura interlocks with the word following and there is no manner of sense-pause.

Observe the following verses:

α 58: ἰέμενος καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρῶσκοντα νοῆσαι. Did the hearer in this verse at first join ἰέμενος καὶ καπνὸν, then readjust his sentence when the infinitive had been spoken?

α 64: τέκνον ἑμὸν, ποῖόν σε ἔπος φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων. Can we believe the hearer, because of the caesura, naturally connected ποῖόν σε? If he did, then he lost the sentence.

Such verses as the following are to be found by thousands:

- α 116: *μνηστήρων τῶν μὲν σκέδασιν κατὰ δώματα θείη,*
 118: *τὰ φρονέων μνηστήρσι μεθήμενος εἰσὶδ' Ἀθήνην,*
 122: *καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·*
 123: *χαῖρε, ξεῖνε, παρ' ἄμμι φιλήσεται· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα.*

If the caesura had any interpretative force the following verse would have been misunderstood by the hearers:

α 141: *δαιτρὸς δὲ κρειῶν πίνακας παρέθηκεν αἰέρας.* The caesura would construe *δαιτρὸς δὲ κρειῶν*, but we know from π 49: *τοῖσιν δὲ κρειῶν πίνακας παρέθηκε συβώτης*, that this would be the wrong construction.

If the hearer looked for exegetical help in the caesura he lost the meaning of the following verses:

- α 247: *ἦδ' ὅσσοι κραναῇν Ἰθάκην κάτα κοιρανέουσιν,*
 397: *αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν οἴκοιο ἀναξ' ἔσομ' ἡμετέριοι*
 432: *ἴσα δέ μιν κεδνὴ ἀλόχῃ τίεν ἐν μεγάροισιν,*
 442: *ἀργυρέη, ἐπὶ δὲ κληῖδ' ἐτάνυσσεν ἱμάντι.*
 β 50: *μητέρι μοι μνηστήρες ἐπέχραον οὐκ ἐθελούσῃ,*
 165: *ἐγγὺς ἐὼν τοῖσδεσσι φόνον καὶ κῆρα φυτεύει,*
 171: *καὶ γὰρ κείνῃ φημὶ τελευτηθῆναι ἅπαντα,*
 180: *ταῦτα δ' ἐγὼ σέο πολλὸν ἀμείνων μαντεύεσθαι.*
 184: *ᾧφελες· οὐκ ἂν τόσσα θεοπροπέων ἀγόρευες,*
 237: *σφᾶς γὰρ παρθέμενοι κεφαλὰς κατέδονσι βιαίως.*

A sense-pause at the caesura would give the rendering, "They eat off their own heads," which is probably a fact, but not the sense intended by the poet.

301: *Ἀντίνοος δ' ἰθὺς γελάσας κίε Τηλεμάχοιο,*

319: *ἔμπορος· οὐ γὰρ νηὸς ἐπήβολος οὐδ' ἐρετῶν.*

Unless the hearer immediately joined *νηὸς ἐπήβολος* all the sarcasm in the words of Telemachus was lost.

373: *ἄλλ' ὅμοσον μὴ μητρὶ φίλῃ τάδε μνησασθαι.* When Telemachus had spoken as far as the caesura, did the nurse think he was saying, "Do not swear at mother!"?

386: *ἦ δ' αὖτε Φρονόιοι Νόημονα φαιδιμον νῖον,*

404: *ἄλλ' ἴομεν, μὴ δηθὰ διατρίβωμεν ὁδοῖο.*

γ 17: *ἄλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἰθὺς κίε Νέστορος ἱπποδάμοιο·*

272: *τὴν δ' ἐθέλων ἐθέλουσαν ἀνήγαγεν ὄνδε δόμονδε.*

463: *ᾧπτων δ' ἀκροπόρους ὀβελούς ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες.*

δ 29: *ἦ ἄλλον πέμπωμεν ἱκανέμεν, ὅς κε φιλήσῃ.* The assumed exegetical force of the caesura would have involved that verse in great confusion, since ἄλλον must not be construed with *πέμπωμεν*, but with *ἱκανέμεν*.

94: *καὶ πατέρων τάδε μέλλετ' ἀκούμεν, οἳ τινες ὦμιν,*

294: *ἄλλ' ἄγετ' εἰς εὐνὴν τράπεθ' ἡμέας, ὄφρα καὶ ἦδῃ,*

592: *ἀθανάτοις ἐμίθεν μεμνημένος ἥματα πάντα.*

762: *κλυθί μεν, αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς τέκος, ἀτρυτώνῃ,*

- 811: πωλε', ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλὸν ἀπόπροθι δώματα ναίεις.
 ε 101: ἄσπετον; οὐδὲ τις ἄγχι βροτῶν πόλις, οἳ τε θεοῖσιν
 222: τλήσομαι ἐν στήθεσιν ἔχων ταλαπενθέα θυμόν·
 317: δεινὴ μισγομένων ἀνέμων ἐλθοῦσα θύελλα,
 478: τοὺς μὲν ἄρ' οὐτ' ἀνέμων διάη μένος ὑγρὸν ἀέντων,
 ζ 71: ὥς εἰπὼν δμῳέσσιν ἐκέλετο, τοὶ δὲ πίθοντο.
 98: εἴματα δ' ἡελίοιο μένον τεροσήμεναι αὐγῇ,
 197: τοῦ δ' ἐκ Φαιήκων ἔχεται κάρτος τε βίη τε.
 η 45: ὑψηλά, σκολόπεσσιν ἀρηρότα, θαῦμα ιδέσθαι.
 73: οὐ μὲν γάρ τι νόον γε καὶ αὐτὴ δεύεται ἐσθλοῦ.
 142: ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' Ἀρήτης βάλε γούνασι χεῖρας Ὀδυσσεύς.

Surely no ancient auditor of Homer jumped at the conclusion that Odysseus made his entry by embracing the queen, yet that is what the exegetical caesura would demand.

- θ 97: κέκλυτε, Φαιήκων ἡγήτορες ἡδὲ μέδοντες.
 351: δειλαί τοι δειλῶν γε καὶ ἐγγύαι ἐγγυάσθαι.
 ι 65: πρίν τινα τῶν δειλῶν ἐτάρων τρεῖς ἕκαστον αὔσαι.

This verse is extremely complex and if there had been any exegetical force in the caesura the hearer could never have grasped its meaning. The subject of the infinitive is *τινα*, while the genitive τῶν δειλῶν limits ἕκαστον.

- 126: οὐδ' ἄνδρες ἠῶν ἐν τέκτονες, οἳ κε κάμοιεν
 441: τερόμενος πάντων δίων ἐπεμαίετο νῶτα
 443: ὥς οἱ ἔπ' εἰροπόκων δίων στέρνοισι δίδεντο.
 κ 44: Αἴολος. ἄλλ' ἄγε θάσσον ἰδῶμεθα, ὅττι τὰδ' ἐστίν,
 86: ἐγγὺς γὰρ νυκτός τε καὶ ἡματός εἰσι κέλευθοι.
 274: ὥς εἰπὼν παρὰ νηὸς ἀνήιον ἡδὲ θαλάσσης.
 333: ἄλλ' ἄγε δὴ κολεῶ μὲν ἄορ θέο, νῶι δ' ἔπειτα
 λ 154: καί μ' ὀλοφυρομένη ἔπειτα πτερόεντα προσηῦδα·
 253: ὥς εἰπὼν ὑπὸ πόντον ἐδύσσετο κυμαίνοντα.
 381: τοῦτων σοι φθονέοιμι καὶ οἰκτρότερ' ἄλλ' ἀγορεύειν,
 μ 368: ἄλλ' ὅτε δὴ σχεδὸν ἦα κίων νεὸς ἀμφιελίσσης,
 καὶ τότε με κνίσσης ἀμφήλυθεν θερμὸς αὐτμή.
 οἰμώξας δὲ θεοῖσι μέγ' ἀθανάτοισι γεγώνεν·
 ν 411: ἔνθα μένειν καὶ πάντα παρήμενος ἐξερέσθαι,
 431: ξανθὰς δ' ἐκ κεφαλῆς ὄλεσε τρίχας, ἀμφὶ δὲ δέρμα
 ξ 21: πὰρ δὲ κύνες θήρεσσιν εὐκότες αἰὲν ἱανον
 68: ἄλλ' ὀλεθ'· ὥς ὤφελ' Ἑλένης ἀπὸ φῦλον ὀλέσθαι

Interpretation by means of the caesura would render this verse thus, "But he perished, as he ought."

- 168: πῖνε, καὶ ἄλλα παρέξ μεμνῶμεθα, μηδέ με τοῦτων
 ο 224: τηλεδαπός, φεύγων ἐξ Ἀργεὺς ἄνδρα κατακτάς,
 π 179: ταρβήσας δ' ἐτέρωσε βάλλ' ὄμματα, μὴ θεὸς εἴη.
 411: πεύθετο γὰρ οὐ παιδὸς ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ὀλεθρον·

- ρ 208: ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' αἰγείρων ὕδατοτρεφῶν ἦν ἄλσος
 283: οὐ γάρ τι πληγέων ἀδαήμων οὐδὲ βολάων.
 363: γνοίῃ θ', οἳ τινὲς εἰσιν ἐναίσιοι οἳ τ' ἀθέμστοι·
 404: αὐτὸς γὰρ φαγέμεν πολλὸν βούλειαι ἡ δόμεν ἄλλω.
 σ 324: ἀλλ' οἷδ' ὥς ἔχε πένθος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ Πηνελοπείης

Πηνελοπείης is not to be construed with the word which is next, but with the noun just before the caesura.

- 340: ὥς εἰπὼν ἐπέεσσι διεπτοίησε γυναῖκας.
 τ 339: νοσφισάμην ἐπὶ νηὸς ἰὼν δολιχρήτμοιο,
 υ 58: κλαῖε δ' ἄρ' ἐν λέκτροισι καθεζομένη μαλακοῖσιν.
 290: μνάσκει' Ὀδυσσεύς δὴν οἰχομένοιο δάμαρτα.
 343: αἰδέομαι δ' ἀέκουσαν ἀπὸ μεγάροιο δέεσθαι

φ 223: κλαῖον ἄρ' ἀμφ' Ὀδυσσῆι δαΐφρονι χεῖρε βαλόντε
 The context here shows that the dative is not governed by the verb but by the participle, despite the intervening caesura.

- 406: ὥς ὅτ' ἀνὴρ φόρμιγγος ἐπιστάμενος καὶ αἰοιδῆς
 χ 413: τοῖσδε δὲ μοῖρ' ἐδάμασσε θεῶν καὶ σκέτλια ἔργα·
 ψ 267: χαίρω, ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλὰ βροτῶν ἐπὶ ἄστε' ἄνωγεν
 ἐλθέιν ἐν χεῖρεσσιν ἔχοντ' ἐνῆρες ἑρετμόν.

The exegetical caesura shows that Odysseus was "to go on his hands."

- 296: ἀσπασίοι λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ θεσμὸν ἵκοντο·
 ω 241: τὰ φρονέων ἱθὺς κίεν αὐτοῦ διος Ὀδυσσεύς.
 251: οὐ μὲν ἀεργίης γε ἀναξ' ἔνεκ' οὐ σε κομίζει,
 372: καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·

In this stock epic verse the second word depends on the last and φωνήσας takes no object.

From the foregoing illustrations it is evident that the poet did not regard the caesura in the third foot as more than a metrical pause. The very fact that there is a caesura in a foot makes it likely that it would mark the end of a phrase, a clause, or a sentence, and to that extent coincide with a pause or break in the thought, but the aid of the caesura can hardly be summoned to determine the meaning of any Homeric verse.

However the hexameter might have originated, the parts of the verse are so interlocked that we must assume in view of such verses as

- ε 287: ἀμφ' Ὀδυσσῆι ἐμῷ μετ' Ἀιθίοπεσσιν ἐόντος·
 478: τοὺς μὲν ἄρ' οὗτ' ἀνέμων διάη μένος ὑγρὸν ἀέντων,

that the poet regarded it as a metrical unit, and that this unit could be handled with the greatest freedom.

The help furnished by the caesura in matters of contrast or emphasis is largely subjective and a matter of personal interpretation. In such a verse as the following, α 7: αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο, any one of four might be regarded as the word of especial emphasis. While in α 58: ἰέμενος καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρῶσκοντα νοῆσαι, there can be no doubt

that the emphatic word is *καπνόν*, yet so little weight did the poet give to the emphasis-producing effect of the caesura that he put the emphatic *καί* before *καπνόν* and thus marked the word on which especial stress is laid.

The only conclusion which I can reach is the negative one, that the Homeric caesura is purely metrical and furnishes little or no indication of the construction or meaning of the verse.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

"UNMIXED MILK," *Odyssey* ix. 296-98

After describing the horrible meal of Polyphemos (*Odyssey* ix. 287-93), and the consternation of the Greeks, Homer thus narrates how the monster retired for the night (*Odyssey* ix. 296-98):

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Κύκλωψ μεγάλην ἐμπλήσατο νηδὺν
ἀνδρόμεα κρέ' ἔδων καὶ ἐπ' ἄκρητον γάλα λέγει, ἐν
κεῖτ' ἔντοσθ' ἄντροιο τανυσσάμενος διὰ μήλων.

From the time of Eustathius to the present there has been no little speculation as to what the words *ἄκρητον γάλα* mean, and commentators seem to have been unable to quote other passages from Greek literature referring to either "mixed" or "unmixed" milk as a beverage in order to throw light upon the action of Polyphemos. Eustathius explains the phrase as meaning milk wherein the essential parts are all present, *ἄκρητον δὲ γάλα λέγει, ἐν ᾧ ἔστιν ἔτι τὸ τυρώδες καὶ τὸ ἐλαιώδες καὶ τὸ ὀρώδες*.¹ Modern editors have offered at least two types of explanation. Some state that the words are used for humorous effect, by suggesting the familiar *ἄκρατος οἶνος*, "wine not diluted with water"; others, that they are to be understood literally to signify that Polyphemos, as the embodiment of all that is intemperate, did not follow the ordinary Greek custom of diluting the milk in the same fashion as wine.² Against the latter group, however, the objection may be brought that aside from the passage under discussion they seem unable to cite any literary evidence for the alleged custom of diluting milk with water; it is, indeed, a fine instance of argument in a circle. Eustathius, it has been seen, did not adopt this view, so obvious if the practice existed as is claimed; and

¹ Cf. the scholium, *ἀπαραιγέες ἔχον καὶ ὀρώδες καὶ τὸ τυρώδες καὶ τὸ ἐλαιώδες* (Dindorf, II, 429).

² For the first explanation, the Perrin-Seymour school edition may be cited; for the second, Ameis (11th ed.), Buchholz, *Die homerischen Realien*, II, 2, p. 177; Merry-Riddell (who say "the use of *ἄκρητον* shows that the common custom was to dilute milk with water, or perhaps to curdle the milk and drink only the whey"); O. Henke in Teubner's *Schulausgabe*, 1906 ("auch Milch ungemischt zu trinken gilt als unmässig"); Düntzer, Paderborn, 1875 (who explains *ἄκρητον* as meaning *rein*). I suspect that Ameis is the authority for most of these annotations. Hayman and others pass over the line with no especial comment.

furthermore, if it is impossible to support the theory with Greek testimony, it would seem to be nearly as difficult to argue the case on purely logical grounds, and to deduce from the fact that the temperate Greeks usually diluted their wine the further fact that they added water to milk also. The qualification of wine was to avoid intoxication, while the only reason for diluting such an innocent beverage as milk would be to make it less rich and *fett*, as the Germans say. There is, however, plenty of evidence that Homer's Achaeans liked fat meat and there is no reason to suppose that they did not also like rich milk.¹ Professor W. A. Oldfather, in *Classical Philology*, VIII, 195 ff., has already pointed out most of these objections to the modern interpretations of the passage, and favors a return to that offered by Eustathius and the scholiast, namely, that "unmixed milk" is milk the essential parts of which are not separated out by the use of rennet or *όρός*. I am inclined to believe that he dismisses somewhat too hastily the suggestion that *άκρητον* is used for humorous effect (Homer's humor is of the grim sort), for after all *άκρητος* very strongly connotes dilution with water. It is without doubt for this reason that no one has imagined the Cyclop's drink to be milk "unmixed" with ingredients like wine or honey. Still Professor Oldfather's view is not lightly to be rejected.

My purpose, however, is not so much to discuss Homer's real meaning or the theme of milk-drinking in antiquity as to call attention to the fact that there is very probably a definite attempt to interpret the Odyssean phrase in vs. 218 of the *Cyclops* of Euripides. It may be added that if the lines which will be quoted are really a reference to Homer, the very fact that Euripides saw fit to suggest in this way an interpretation shows that he did not easily understand what Homer's "unmixed milk" meant, and that this is good additional proof that mixing of milk and water was never a custom of the Greeks; for if it had been, Euripides would certainly never have given the explanation that he does. Polyphemus, returning from the chase, inquires of the Chorus what the prospects are for his meal, in the following words (vss. 216-19):

| | |
|---------|--|
| KYKΛΩΨ. | ἦ καὶ γάλακτός εἰσι κρατῆρες ² πλέψ; |
| ΧΟΡΟΣ. | ὥστ' ἐκπιεῖν γέ σ', ἣν θέλῃς, ὅλον πίθον. |
| KYK. | μηλεῖον ἢ βοεῖον ἢ μεμιγμένον; |
| XO. | ὅν ἂν θέλῃς σύ· μή με καταπίῃς μόνον. ³ |

¹ In fact the fondness of the Greeks for *σύνμηκτον γάλα* and *πυός* (or *πῦος*) points in this direction. Cf. I. von Müller in *Müllers Handbuch*, IV, 1, 2, p. 128, and Keller, *Die Antike Tierwelt*, II, 352.

² I think that the poet here uses the word *κρατῆρες* (vessels for mixing wine and water) simply as a general term, with no special implication. In any case the *κρατῆρες* are to contain only milk or mixed varieties of milk, and as a matter of fact the Euripidean Cyclops apparently does not yet know what wine is. The word suggests riches; cf. *infra*, p. 444, n. 4.

³ W. Schmid discusses the text of this verse in *Philologus*, LV, 55.

The mixing of two kinds of milk was not a common practice, it is safe to say, and the modern authorities on the customs of the ancients do not mention it at all. There is, then, no reason why this question of the Cyclops, unique and otherwise unmotivated, should be introduced into the play at all unless it has reference to Homer's ἀκρητον γάλα. Without doubt the spectators would recognize and appreciate it as such, for the Cyclops episode was one of the best known of the *Odyssey*, as its frequent representations in art testify; and it is not out of accord with the character of Euripides that he should in the course of a drama attempt to deal with a minor point of Homeric exegesis. It may not, in fact, be his own interpretation, but one offered by some contemporary expounder of the epic and current in Athenian circles at the time.

It is of course to be noted that in Homer, Polyphemus does not own cattle, but only sheep and goats. In Homer men do not drink cow's milk,¹ but in Euripides' time it was used, together with the sheep's and goat's milk drunk by the Homeric heroes.² We cannot therefore regard the Euripidean passage as an *ad litteram* commentary on the mysterious ἀκρητον γάλα unless we admit that Euripides failed to notice the absence of cattle from among Polyphemus' live stock and was ignorant of Homeric custom in the matter of milk-drinking; but none the less there is no good reason for the existence of the Euripidean line if it is not a reference to Homer, and it occurs in a play that is full of allusions to the Odyssean Cyclops episode.³ The introduction of cattle among Polyphemus' possessions is simply another instance where the dramatist for his own reasons deviated from his Homeric model,⁴ perhaps purposely, perhaps inadvertently. Had he been writing as an antiquarian he might have put it, "Sheep's milk or goat's or mixed?"

Euripides' interpretation of *Odyssey* ix. 297 is the earliest that we have, but it can hardly be regarded as establishing the real meaning of the phrase ἀκρητον γάλα, although, as I have pointed out, it affords strong evidence against the theory of Ameis and Buchholz and their assertions with regard to the dilution of milk when drunk. Moreover, the existence of this curious Homeric reference in the *Cyclops* gives further proof of the strong interest in literary problems and the critical spirit of Euripides ὁ σοφός.

FRANK EGGLESTON ROBBINS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

¹ Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, p. 219.

² I. von Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

³ Comparisons of the Homeric and Euripidean treatments of the Cyclops story have been made by C. B. Newcomer, *De Cyclope Homérico atque Euripideo*, Berlin, 1899, and G. R. Holland, *De Polyphemo et Galatea*, in "Leipziger Studien," VII. Neither calls attention to the point discussed above.

⁴ Noted as such by Newcomer, *op. cit.*, p. 16. Holland, *op. cit.*, p. 172, suggests that Euripides may make the Cyclops own cattle in order to portray him as being as rich as possible.

THE USE OF "GENS" AND "FAMILIA" BY SUETONIUS

Dr. Radin's interesting paper in *Class. Phil.*, IX, 235 ff., suggested an examination of these terms in Suetonius, who represents a time later than that which Dr. Radin considered, but might be expected to use the words with the accuracy of a scholar. The most important result of the investigation has been the conviction that the use of the words in question, like that of many others, is often affected by the context and by special factors, in particular by formulas of divers kinds.

So far as our indices may be trusted,¹ Suetonius uses *gens* seven times to designate nations, excluding a quotation from Vergil,² and always consistently of foreign nations. *Natio* occurs twice, in both cases without distinction from *gens* and for special reasons. In *Aug.* 21.1, "alias item nationes . . . ad obsequium redegit," Suetonius uses *nationes* merely for variety, since he has *gentes Inalpinas* a few lines before, while the next sentence begins with *nec ulli genti*. For the same reason "ad obsequium redegit" takes the place of *domuit* and *coercuit* in the preceding sentence. In *Gramm.* 8, "natione Syrus," and *Gramm.* 20, "natione Hispanus," we have a formula common in inscriptions, in which the place of *natione* is sometimes taken by *domo* and *genere*, but never by *gente*.

In the sense of a "super-family" or clan, Suetonius uses *gens* six times, always consistently, and once at least clearly distinguishing *gens* from *familia*: *Nero* 1.1, "ex gente Domitia duae familiae claruerunt, Calvinorum et Ahenobarborum."³ He specifically mentions a plebeian *gens* in *Tib.* 1.1, "patricia gens Claudia—fuit enim et alia plebeia . . . —orta est ex Regillis."⁴ He does not use *gens* of similar super-families outside of Rome.

The adjectives *gentilis* and *gentilicius*, which Dr. Radin rarely finds in Livy,⁵ occur respectively six times and twice in Suetonius,⁶ in every case but one having the meaning of "belonging to or relating to a *gens*" in the sense of a super-family. The sole exception to his consistency in the use of these adjectives is in *Nero* 41.1, "nihil autem aequè doluit, quam ut . . . pro Nerone Ahenobarbum appellatum; et nomen quidem gentile . . .

¹ I have been able to add one or two examples, but cannot guarantee absolute completeness. For the reader's convenience I have cited the examples, although nearly all of them are to be found in the index of the Baumgarten-Crusius edition.

² *Aug.* 40.5; the other cases are: *Jul.* 24.3; 84.5; *Aug.* 19.1; 21.1; 44.1; *Tib.* 9.2; *Vesp.* 4.1. In another quotation from Vergil (*Dom.* 9.1) *impia gens* is used generally of the human race.

³ *Jul.* 6.1, "a Venere Iulii, cuius gentis familia est nostra," should probably not be counted, since it occurs in a quotation from Caesar's eulogy of his aunt Julia; cf. *Galb.* 3.1, quoted below, p. 446.

⁴ The other examples of *gens* in this sense are: *Aug.* 2.1; *Tib.* 2.3; *Vesp.* 1.1.

⁵ He seems to have overlooked Livy 6.20.14.

⁶ *Gentilis*: *Tib.* 68.2; *Nero* 37.1; 41.1; 50; *Vit.* 1.3; and, as a subst., *Tib.* 1.2. *Gentilicius*: *Jul.* 1.2; *Claud.* 25.3.

resumpturum se professus est deposito adoptivo." Both Nero and Ahenobarbus are of course *cognomina* and not "gentile" names. Now it is obvious from Nero 1.1, cited above, that Suetonius recognized the difference between the *gens* Domitia and the *familiae* of the Calvini and Ahenobarbi. That he also distinguished "gentile" names from *cognomina* and put Nero as well as Ahenobarbus in the latter class is clear from Tib. 1.2, "inter cognomina autem et Neronis assumpsit"; cf. Claud. 25.3, "peregrinae condicionis homines vetuit usurpare Romana nomina dum taxat gentilia." We must then seek some special reason for his exceptional use of *nomen gentile* in Nero 41.1. This appears to be the lack of a suitable expression to balance *adoptivo* (*nomine*). *Cognomen* would not have done this, and "nomen familiare" or "nomen familiae" hardly seems good Latin for "family name." He therefore used *gentile*, not in the sense of "gentile," but rather in that of "belonging (originally) to his *gens*," or "hereditary in his *gens*," as opposed to *adoptivo*. We may perhaps say that his rhetoric prevailed over his accuracy, for Mackail's remark (*Lat. Lit.*, p. 231) that Suetonius is "frankly without style" goes too far.¹ We have already noted his care in avoiding repetition of the same word in neighboring clauses, and examples of his rhetoric are not far to seek. One of the editors-in-chief of the Loeb Library appended to a suggestive comment on this feature, "I find to my amazement that Suetonius has a style,"² and the same discovery will be made by anyone who reads his pages with attention to that feature.

I have been able to discover no essential difference in Suetonius' use of *gentile* and *gentilicium*, or to find other examples of either "gentile nomen" or "gentilicium nomen"; the usual term is simply *nomen*.

Familia is used six times of a collection of *famuli* in general, and twice specifically of gladiatorial "families."³ With the meaning of a "family" in the modern sense the word occurs sixteen times, in two instances being clearly distinguished from *gens*. These instances are Nero 1.1, cited above, and Galb. 3.1, "imagines et eloquia universi generis exsequi longum est, familiae breviter attingam." Although in the latter example, as will appear, I do not regard *generis* as a synonym of *gens*, the reference nevertheless is to the *gens* Sulpicia as distinguished from the family of the Sulpicii Galbae, as is obvious from what follows: "qui primus Sulpiciorum cognomen Galbae tulit cur aut unde traxerit, ambigitur."

¹ Still less would a careful reader of Suetonius subscribe to Mackail's statement that "Suetonius measures more than half the distance from the fine familiar prose of the Golden Age to the base jargon of the authors of the Augustan History."

² I quote from memory, but accurately as regards the sense of the remark. To the favorable views of his art may now be added that of J. D. Duff, *Jour. of Phil.*, XXXIII (1914), 161 ff.

³ Calig. 55.3; Claud. 18.1; Nero 4; 44.1; Vit. 10.2; Gramm. 4; Jul. 10.2; Aug. 42.3.

In nine cases¹ no such distinction is made, but *familia* seems to be used of a family as a subdivision of a *gens*. It is obvious that Suetonius does not recognize the limitation of a family to four generations (*Class. Phil.*, IX, 238, with footnote). In *Nero* 2.1, after saying in the preceding chapter "pluris e familia cognosci referre arbitror," referring to the Ahenobarbi, he continues: "ut igitur paulo altius repetam, atavus eius," etc. Again he traces the duplex "Octavium familia" (*Aug.* 2.2) back to the *abavus*, if not to the *atavus*. Another case of the kind is that of the Sulpicii Galbae (*Galb.* 3). That *familia* in these cases means "family" and not "race" or "stock" seems obvious from Suetonius' consistent use of *stirpe* or *genere* in the latter sense.

We have left three examples in which *familia* might be thought to refer to a "super-family" or *gens*: *Tib.* 3.1, "insertus est et Liviorum familiae adoptato in eam materno avo. Quae familia, quamquam plebeia . . . admodum floruit"; *Claud.* 2.1, "fratre maiore [Claudii] in Iuliam familiam adoptato"; *Claud.* 39.2, "divulgavit neminem umquam per adoptionem familiae Claudiae insertum."

The suspicion that Suetonius used *familia* of a plebeian *gens*, which might be aroused by the first example, is dispelled by the two which follow, to say nothing of the fact that in *Tib.* 1.1 he uses (in effect) the expression *gens plebeia*. Since all the passages refer to adoption, his deviation from his regular usage is more naturally attributed to the influence of the formula "in familiam nomenque adoptare" (*Jul.* 83.2), a formula of which we find the variations "adscire in nomen" (*Claud.* 39.2) and "in bona et nomen adscire" (*Galb.* 17), but never "in gentem adoptare (adscire)." The second use of *familia* in the first example is influenced by the previous use of the word; obviously it would be awkward to say "insertum est et Liviorum familiae. . . . Quae gens."

He uses the adjective *familiaris* in the sense of "belonging to a (the) family" in *Lares familiares* (*Calig.* 5), *familiarem vitam* (*Aug.* 61.1) and in the frequent *res familiaris*. Perhaps too in *familiare convivium* (*Tib.* 13.1) and *familiari cenae* (*Tit.* 9.2), although the latter at least seems doubtful.

Suetonius' use of *gens* and *familia* thus seems to be more regular and consistent than that of Livy. If my interpretation of the doubtful passage is correct, and if no significant example has escaped the makers of the indices, he uses *gens* consistently of a super-family, recognizing plebeian *gentes* and a division of *gentes* into *familiae* (but not into *stirpes*, as will appear). There is no certain example of a confusion of *gens* and *familia*, and no time limit is set on the meaning of the latter word.

In speaking of descent or race in more general terms, Suetonius uses several words, such as *stirpes*, *genus*, *domus*, and *imagines*. He apparently

¹ *Jul.* 1.1; *Aug.* 2.2; 2.3; *Calig.* 36.1; *Nero* 32.2; *Galb.* 3.2; *Otho* 1.1; *Vit.* 1.1; *Vesp.* 1.3. In the last three instances *familia* is used of families outside of Rome.

does not use *nomen* in the sense of "family"; for in the formulas of adoption, of which examples have been given, the occurrence of *familiam* beside *nomen* shows that the latter word has a different connotation. *Jul.* 6.1 and *Vesp.* 4.5 do not appear to me to be examples of *nomen=familia*.

Domus is used six times¹ with the meaning "family." In *Vit.* 2.2, "P. Vitellius, domo Nuceria," it is a substitute for *natione* in the sense of "a native of" and is of course more properly used than *natione* would be in the case of an Italian town; cf. "*natione Hispanus*" and "*natione Syrus*," cited above.

He appears to use *genus*, as applied to Roman and Italian families, more frequently than Livy, having it at least a dozen times, including *Gramm.* 18, "L. Crassicius, genere Tarentinus," which is formulaic.² In this connection it may be noted that in the *De grammaticis* Suetonius has frequent occasion to refer to nationality and birthplace and that he avoids repetition with considerable skill, using *natione* twice, *genere*, *domo*, *natus*, and the geographic adjective. He uses *stirps* in the same sense as *genus* eight times.³

It seems very doubtful whether either *genus* or *stirps* is ever used as an actual synonym of *gens* or *familia*. The former might be suspected in *Tib.* 3.1, where after speaking at length of the history of the gens Claudia, Suetonius continues: "ex hac stirpe Tiberius Caesar genus trahit." But "ex hac stirpe" surely means "from such stock as this," rather than "from this gens" or "from such a gens as this." The same thing is true of *Vit.* 1.2 "horum (= Vitelliorum) residuam stirpem ex Sabinis transisse Romam," where, besides, *stirps* is used of the family before it moved to Rome. In fact, there seems to be no case in which either *gens* or *familia* could be substituted for *stirps* or *genus* without change of meaning. Indeed Suetonius in these cases, as in others, chose his words with great care, using *gens* only when it was strictly appropriate to the situation and regulating his use of *familia* by the same conditions. Thus in *Jul.* 59, "despectissimum quendam ex Corneliae genere . . . in castris secum habebat," it seems highly improbable that the *despectissimus* in question was a recognized member of the gens Cornelia. In *Vesp.* 12, "conantis quosdam originem Flavii generis ad conditores Reatinos comitemque Herculis . . . referre irrisit ultro," we might substitute *gentis* for *generis*, if it were not that the time referred to antedated the founding of Rome and the existence of *gentes*. In *Galb.* 3.1, "imagines et elogia universi generis exsequi longum est, familiae breviter attingam," one might say that there is no visible objection to such a substitution, but the fact that Suetonius has just said that Galba traced his ancestry on his father's side to Jupiter and on his mother's to Pasiphae makes *genus*

¹ *Aug.* 25.1; 58.2; 65.1; *Calig.* 13; *Galb.* 2; 4.4.

² *Jul.* 6.1; 59; 72; *Aug.* 5; 44.1; *Tib.* 3.1; *Galb.* 3.1; *Otho* 1.2; *Vesp.* 1.2; 4.5; 12; *Tit.* 4.2; 9.1; *Gr.* 18; of foreign nations, *Calig.* 22.1; *Nero* 28; 37.2.

³ *Jul.* 39.1; *Aug.* 4.1; 43.2; *Tib.* 3.1; *Calig.* 35.1; *Vit.* 1.2; 1.3; 2.2.

more suitable than *gens* in speaking of so very "ancient" a family, the origin of which went back to a time before the Roman *gentes* were thought of.

There is certainly no trace in Suetonius of the use of *stirps* as a subdivision of a *gens*. I should be inclined to add that there is no evidence for the use of *genus*, *stirps*, or any other word as the exact equivalent of *gens* or *familia*.

Another word which should be included in the last class is *imagines*; see *Calig.* 23.1, "suscensebatque si qui vel oratione vel carmine imaginibus eum [= Agrippam] Caesarum insereret," and cf. *Cic. Leg. Agr.* 2. 100.

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

CATULLUS 95

Smyrna mei Cinnae nonam post denique messem
 quam coepta est nonamque edita post hiemem,
 millia cum interea quingenta Hortensius uno
 Smyrna cavas Satrachi penitus mittetur ad undas,
 Smyrnam cana diu saecula peruoluent.
 at Volusi annales Paduam morientur ad ipsam
 et laxas scombris saepe dabunt tunicas.
 parua mei mihi sint cordi monimenta . . . ,
 at populus tumido gaudeat Antimacho.

The appearance of the name "Hortensius" (Munro calls it the "absurd Hortensius") in l. 3 of this poem has caused commentators much trouble. The evidence adduced to show that it is out of place may be divided into two classes, external and internal. It is principally with the internal evidence that I am concerned.

The chief argument from internal evidence is that the unity and balance of the poem are destroyed when the name of Hortensius is introduced. Ellis (*Commentary*, p. 470) says: "No one has stated this difficulty so clearly as Fröhlich: 'If both halves of the poem form a single whole the same two poets must be mentioned in either half: if Cinna and Hortensius in the first, then Cinna and Hortensius in the second; and conversely if Cinna and Volusius in the second, then Cinna and Volusius in the first. To bring together three writers, as our epigram does, would produce a poem comparable with a syllogism of four terms,' p. 276." Schwabe (*Quaestiones Catullianae*, p. 282) states the difficulty as follows: "Quis enim tantam inuenustatem Catullo imputare potest ut poetam, postea quam in carminis parte priore primum Zmyrnae Hortensii et Tanusii carmina mala opposuerit, in fine vim totius carminis comprehensurum Hortensii oblitum Tanusii solius mentionem fecisse credat?" It is, then, the opinion of many commentators that the third and fourth lines should have reference to Volusius and to him alone (Schwabe

identifying Volusius with one Tanusius mentioned by Seneca *Epist.* 93. 9). Fröhlich, Schwabe, Schmidt, Baehrens, and Munro all declare "Hortensius" to be a corrupted reading.

The difficulties raised by these scholars disappear when we grasp the plan of Catullus' poem. The epigram is written in praise of the "Smyrna," a carefully elaborated poem adhering closely to the canons of the Alexandrian School, written by Catullus' friend, C. Helvius Cinna. That the main purpose of the epigram is to praise the poem of Cinna rather than to ridicule the works of Hortensius and Volusius is evidenced by the use of the word "Smyrna" at the very beginning and by its anaphoric repetition in ll. 5 and 6. The epigram is built upon antithesis, as is the case with so many of Catullus' epigrams (e.g., cc. 70, 91, 97, 103, 105). In the first distich Catullus tells how the poem of Cinna has finally appeared after nine long years of careful workmanship. Then, in the second distich, by way of contrast he tells about Hortensius, who writes a large number of wretched verses in a very short time. Catullus now begins the second half of the poem by again singing the praises of the "Smyrna": it shall be known the world over; the "centuries grown old" shall thumb its pages. Again in contrast, the poet introduces in the fourth distich the name of another poetaster who cares more for quantity than quality, Volusius. We see how admirably the antithesis is maintained: the "Smyrna" shall travel to the distant waters of the Satrachus (the home of its heroine), but Volusius' "Annals" shall go no farther than the banks of the Padua (the home of their author); the "Smyrna" shall be read forever, but the fate of the "Annals" shall be to supply wrappers for mackerel.

The main part of the epigram ends with l. 8. The final distich is devoted to a formal conclusion, and here we see the wonderful art of the poet in binding together the parts of the poem. In l. 9 he reverts to the poem of Cinna, thereby connecting the first and third distichs. In l. 10 he reverts to the careless and voluminous writers, binding together the second and fourth distichs, uniting the names of Hortensius and Volusius under that of the Greek poet Antimachus. I cannot understand why commentators should maintain that in mentioning Antimachus the poet means Volusius alone. Why Volusius more than Hortensius? Is this not the whole explanation of the use of the name of the Greek poet? Catullus wishes to use the name of a poet in the concluding distich which will typify not merely Volusius, but both Volusius and Hortensius; not merely Volusius and Hortensius, but all poets of their class. Antimachus, then, is mentioned here to represent the general type, of which Hortensius and Volusius are individual representatives. In choosing a poet to represent this type it is natural that Catullus should select one of foreign birth, and one whose fame was far greater than that of the two individuals whom he mentions. And, in spite of Quintilian's statement that the *grammatici* commonly gave Antimachus second place among epic poets (Quint. x. 1. 53), is it strange that Catullus, adhering to the prin-

ciples of Alexandrianism, should choose this author of the "Lyde," the *παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορὸν* (Call. frg. 74b, Schneider), and of the "Thebaid," "magnum illud volumen" (Cic. *Brut.* 51), as the arch-violator of the canon *τὸ μέγα βιβλίον ἴσον τῷ μεγάλῳ κακῷ*? In view of the interpretation I have endeavored to give, the epigram, far from losing emphasis and unity by the introduction of the names of the two poets, Volusius and Hortensius, actually gains thereby, for the *single* work of Cinna is contrasted with the *whole class* of poetry as represented by these writers.

It is, of course, impossible to supply the missing line, but surely the suggestion of Fröhlich, which Baerhens rejects so positively, must express the sense: "versiculorum anno quolibet ediderit." Ellis suggests that this is not the only way of bringing in the name of Hortensius. He says: "We might suppose Hortensius to be introduced as the *patron* of Volusius, condemned in a single month to read 500,000 verses of Volusius' inditing.

Millia cum interea quingenta Hortensius uno
(Mense levis quot habet carta legit Volusi)."

The introduction of Hortensius in the capacity of patron is, on the contrary, the very thing to spoil the unity of the poem, while, in view of the splendid antithesis in the second half of the poem, it seems evident that we must expect a similar antithesis in the first half, and this demands that Hortensius be represented as writing a very large number of miserable verses in a very short time, be it "uno anno," "uno mense," or "uno die."

Various editors, beginning with Achilles Statius, have maintained that the last two lines are really part of another epigram, or else constitute a complete epigram by themselves. Lachmann in his edition separates these lines, and Haupt (*Opuscula* I. 1) inclines to this view. I have not found that either of these authorities states his reason, but Munro, assuming that only Volusius is meant by "Antimacho" in l. 10, says that they reject the lines because of the inconsistency of the poet's mentioning Hortensius and Volusius in the earlier part of the epigram and then mentioning only Volusius in conclusion. B. Schmidt (*Prolegomena*, XLIV) rejects the lines on the grounds that Catullus would not say in one part of the poem (ll. 7-8) that Volusius' "Annals" will not live, and farther on make the statement that they are popular. This contention of Schmidt seems well answered by Friedrich in his note to the lines. The parallel of the modern "best-seller" as compared with the standard novels of Dickens, Thackeray, or George Eliot seems so evident as scarcely to need mention. The whole art of the epigram would be ruined if the last two lines were rejected. So far from ruining the unity of the poem they are absolutely essential to it. The use of the final distich to embody a formal conclusion is a favorite device of the epigrammatists. It is used very cleverly by Catullus in c. 69. The first four lines state the difficulty in which Rufus finds himself: no woman will have anything to do with him. The next four lines give the reason. The concluding distich contains the remedy. L. 9 refers to ll. 5-8: Rufus must

destroy the cause of his unpopularity; l. 10 refers to ll. 1-4: or else he must cease to wonder why women avoid him. Among the many instances of this use of the concluding distich by the Greek epigrammatists I may mention Callimachus *A.P.* ix. 566, and *A.P.* xii. 102.

In conclusion, does the interpretation of the epigram as given above throw any light on the missing word at the end of l. 9? We have seen that the purpose of the epigram is to praise the *single* poem "Smyrna" of Cinna by contrasting it with voluminous and carelessly written works *in general*. We must expect, then, in this line some word which will indicate Cinna in a very personal and unequivocal manner. We do not, therefore, want the name of some Greek poet, as Munro insists. I know of nothing better than *sodalis*, the generally accepted emendation.

Possibly the external arguments do not admit of quite so good a case for "Hortensius." The chief objection is that Q. Hortensius Hortalus (for all seem agreed that the Hortensius here alluded to must be the great orator) was a writer of erotic poetry, and sympathized with the same tendencies as Catullus. Without entering into a discussion of this, I will merely mention that fact which, as far as I know, all editors save Ellis seem to ignore, viz., that Hortensius wrote "Annales" (*Vell. Paterc.* ii. 16: "Q. Hortensius in Annalibus suis rettulit"). To be sure, we do not know that these "Annales" were in verse. Must we assume, however, that the Hortensius to whom Catullus alludes is the orator? The name must have been a common one in Rome. Might this not be some obscure poetaster, whose very name would early have passed into oblivion but for this chance mention by Catullus?

RODNEY P. ROBINSON

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

EMENDATION OF MAXIMUS OF TYRE XVII.8

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνταῦθα διφνῇ ὁρῶ· τοῦ γὰρ νοῦ ὁ μὲν νοεῖν πέφυκεν, καὶ μὴ νοῶν· ὁ δὲ καὶ πέφυκε, καὶ νοεῖ.

Instead of διφνῇ we should probably read διπλὴν ὁρῶ (cf. Plato *Sophist* 267E), "I see a crack or a line of cleavage for a logical διαίρεσις," or possibly διαφνῇ (Plato *Politicus* 259D), which involves less change. The greater aptness in the context of the noun in itself makes the emendation plausible. But there is much more to be said for it. Throughout the chapter Maximus is imitating the Platonic method of dichotomy illustrated in the *Sophist* and *Politicus*. This has seemingly escaped the notice of Hobein, *De Maximo Tyrio quaestiones*, pp. 51-52, but is apparent from the vocabulary as well as from the actual procedure of division. διαιρούμενος . . . διχα [cf. Plato *Sophist* 221E and *passim*]-τὴν ἐτέραν τὴν τιμωτέραν τέμνων αἰ [cf. *Sophist* 235C] ἐστ' ἂν ἐφίκηται τοῦ νῦν ζητουμένου [cf. *Phaedrus*

266A. πάλιν τοῦτο τέμνων οὐκ ἐπανήκεν πρὶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐφευρόν, etc.]—τῶν ὄντων τοίνυν τὰ μὲν . . . τὰ δὲ, etc. This imitation of Platonic dichotomy was a favorite device of later philosophers and rhetoricians who desired to display their learning. And the employment of the Platonic gloss διπλόη (*Sophist* 267E) in this connection became almost a fixed convention. In the Platonic passage too it is used with a verb of seeing and followed up with a γὰρ clause with μὲν and δὲ. Aristotle himself does not employ the word. But Platonizing Aristotelian commentators often use it to introduce Aristotelian distinctions. The lexicons do not bring out these facts. The following examples, some of them supplied by my pupil Dr. Misener, are by no means exhaustive, but are sufficient I think to raise a presumption. It may be observed in confirmation of our conjecture (1) that modern editors have found it necessary to restore the word elsewhere, e.g., in Plutarch; (2) that it is used with special frequency to distinguish parts or aspects of the soul.

Plutarch *De virtute morali* 441D: τὴν γὰρ ἑτέραν διπλόην οὐ κατεῖδον, ἀλλὰ τὴν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος μίξιν ἐμφανεστέραν οὖσαν. ὅτι δ' αὐτῆς ἐστὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐν ἑαυτῇ συνθετός τι καὶ διφνὲς καὶ ἀνόμοιον, etc. Here there is the same progress as in Maximus from the distinction of soul and body to distinctions within the soul. I quote Plutarch's use of διφνὲς here in order to deal fairly with the reader. But its occurrence with other synonyms in a different construction does not appreciably weaken the argument for διπλόη as the key-word, supported as it is by the cumulative evidence of other examples. Our purpose does not require a discussion here of the possible relations between Plutarch, Galen, and Posidonius, for which see von Arnim, *Stoicorum Fragmenta*, I, xvi.

In Plutarch's *Pericles* 158B, Ruhnken suggests διπλόη for διαπλοκή. And in *Quaest. conviv.* vii. 10. 715F διπλόας is evidently to be preferred to διπλοῦς. Cf. also *De communibus notitiis* 1083C. The word is a special favorite of the Aristotelian commentators: Themistius on *Ar. De an.* 412A, 22-28: καὶ ταύτην οὖν ἐστὶν εὐρεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν διπλόην, and in several other passages; Simplicius on *De an.* 430A, 23: καὶ γὰρ καὶ παρ' ἐκείνῳ διπλόην τινὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐμφαίνει τὸ αὐτοκίνητον; Ammonius on *Ar. De interpretatione* 16A, 1: ὅταν δὲ διπλόην τινα . . . θεασάμενοι . . . διαιρούμεν αὐτάς, etc.; Syrianus on *Ar. Met.* 1001A, 29: οὐδεμίαν διπλόην οὐδὲ ἐμφασιν πλήθους ἔχοντος ἐν ἑαυτῷ. These instances, which could easily be multiplied, suffice to establish the probability that Maximus, who is steeped in Platonic reminiscences, in a passage where he is obviously imitating the Platonic διαίρεσις, and applying it like the Aristotelian commentators to the soul, used the noun διπλόη, which is almost normal in such a connection, rather than the adjective διφνῆ, which can hardly be construed in the context, and which might easily have been substituted by an ignorant scribe.

PAUL SHOREY

NOTE ON APULEIUS *Metamorphoses* II. 30

Editors of the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius generally change the manuscript reading of the passage in II. 30, "Hic utpote vivus quidem sed tantum sopore mortuus quod eodem mecum vocabulo nuncupatur [or nuncupetur; see Hildebrandt *ad loc.*] ad suum nomen ignarus exsurgit. . . ." Lists of emendations are given by Oudendorp and by Helm. Helm himself inserts *non* before *sopore*. I hope to show that the manuscript reading is perfectly satisfactory.

The passage occurs in Thelyphron's story of how he lost his nose and ears. He was employed to guard a corpse from the Thessalian witches, who, by creeping into death chambers in all manner of disguises, obtain parts of the human body for use in their magic arts. After standing guard for some time and ridding the room of a bold little weasel that had stolen into it, Thelyphron was overcome by sleep; and by such sound sleep "ut ne deus quidem Delficus ipse facile discerneret duobus nobis iacentibus quis esset magis mortuus" (II. 25, end). The next day, the dead man, being brought to life by a sorcerer, told the story of the watch over his body (II. 30): how the witches, having tried in vain to elude the vigilance of the guard, "postremum iniecta somni nebula eoque in profundam quietem sepulto me nomina ciere non prius desierunt, quam dum hebetes artus et membra frigida pigris conatibus ad artis magicae nituntur obsequia." Then comes the passage under discussion.

Now I agree with the editors that if the *quod*-clause in this passage is causal, as scholars, apparently without exception, take it to be, the sentence is extremely awkward. It seems to me, however, that the clause is not causal, but consecutive. The meaning is, in my opinion, "Alive, to be sure, but so dead asleep that he is called by the same name as I." The witches, that is, addressed the dead man as *mortuus*; and the watcher, being *sopore mortuus*, responded to the summons.

Through this interpretation, II. 25, *cit. supr.*, ". . . quis esset magis mortuus," which otherwise has not much point, becomes significant.

For the use of *tantum* in the sense of *tam* there are several parallels already in Augustan writers: Virgil *Georg.* IV. 101; Horace *Sat.* I. 8, 17; II. 3, 313 and 317; II. 5, 80; Ovid *Metam.* XI. 293; Livy XXXVII. 57. This meaning of *tantum* was probably common in colloquial Latin, for it was inherited by the Old French *tant*.

The *quod*-clause of result seems not to be recognized for the Latin of the time of Apuleius. There is no example in Stolz-Schmalz (ed. 4, p. 542) earlier than Claudius Mamertius. Baehrens, in *Mnemosyne*, XXXVIII (1910), 405, cites an instance from the Panegyrici (who wrote at the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century), *Pan.* III. 8, 1. He comments to the effect that the consecutive *quod*-clause is frequent "in posteriore Latinitate." The closest parallel to the clause under discussion which I

can find in earlier writers is Seneca *Naturales Quaestiones* i va, Praef. 9: "Eo enim dementiae venimus, quod qui parce adulatur, pro maligno fit." (The editors change to "ut . . . sit.") Here the *quod*-clause may well be substantive, in apposition with *eo*; but it is undoubtedly of consecutive nature.

FRANCES SHIMER SCHOOL
MOUNT CARROLL, ILL.

A. F. BRÄUNLICH

NOTE ON THEOCRITUS xxii. 31-32

ἐνθα μῆς πολλοὶ κατὰ κλῖμακος ἀμφοτέρων ξί
τοίχων ἄνδρες ἔβαινον Ἰησονίης ἀπὸ νηός.

These verses, which describe the landing of the Argonauts in the Bebrycian country, deserve more comment than they have received from expositors. Mr. Edmonds, in the Loeb Library *Theocritus*, has drawn attention to a latent difficulty by stumbling over it. He translates: "Down the ladders on either side went crowding the men of Jason's ship." Now, it is quite natural to think of two ladders, since "both walls" are mentioned. However, Theocritus has a different picture before his mind, as it seems to me. There is, first, the contrast of *μῆς* and *πολλοί*, similar to that in xiii. 33. With this contrast the phrase *ἀμφοτέρων ξί τοίχων* should not be allowed to interfere; certainly it should not destroy it. The expression "both walls" occurs once before in this idyll, vss. 12-13, and still earlier, in *Theognis* 674. In all three cases it presents a ship under the aspect of starboard and larboard; danger comes from both sides, the heroes as they rowed sat along both sides. Our passage, then, would mean: from both sides of the "Argo" where the heroes had been rowing they thronged down one ladder from Jason's ship.

Aside from linguistic considerations there is reason for rejecting the notion of two ladders. It was long ago pointed out by Brunn¹ that Theocritus in describing this scene is not drawing upon his unaided fancy, but is influenced by types familiar in works of art. A ship drawn up on shore, a voyager on the ladder, other voyagers on the shore or on the deck; this is a typical scene which is found on two Argonautic monuments, the vase painting depicting the death of Talos, the Cretan giant, and the Ficoronian cista. Pausanias in his description of the Nekyia of Polygnotus (x. 25. 3) mentions the ladder, and Robert in his reconstruction of the painting uses the familiar type. A similar use of this type on a Parthenon metope has recently been reported.² The ladder is present on one of the slabs of the Telephus frieze of the Pergamene altar. One who has examined the monuments will hardly believe that because Theocritus mentions "both walls" he has in mind two ladders.

HAMILTON COLLEGE

EDWARD FITCH

¹ *Sitzungsberichte der Bayer. Akad. d. Wissenschaften*, 1879, p. 17; cf. Legrand, *Étude sur Théocrite*, p. 226.

² *A. J. Arch.*, XVII, 539.

NOTE ON HORACE *C.* II. 3. 17-20

Cedes coemptis saltibus et domo
 villaque flavus quam Tiberis lavit,
cedes, et exstructis in altum
divitiis potietur heres.

The words in italics are generally held to mean "riches piled high"; cf. "aeris acervus et auri," *Epp.* i. 2. 47; "solas extruere divitias," Petronius 84. But the fact that Horace makes the approach to this expression with the words "villaque flavus quam Tiberis lavit," as well as his language in other passages points to another interpretation as preferable; cf. *C.* ii. 18. 19 f.:

struis domos,
 marisque Bais obstrepentis urges
 submovere litora,
 parum locuples continente ripa.

On the latter passage Acro quotes a very pertinent parallel, Sallust *Cat.* 20. 11: "quis mortalium . . . tolerare potest illis divitias superare, quas profundant in exstruendo mari . . . ?" Cf. *C.* iii. 24. 3 f. and especially *C.* iii. 1. 33 f.:

Contracta pisces aequora sentiunt
 iactis in altum molibus;

also Sen. *Epp.* 89. 21 (xiii. 1. 21): "ubicumque in aliquem sinum litus curvabitur, vos protinus fundamenta facietis (iactis?) nec contenti solo," etc.; cf. *de Tranq.* 3. 7.

In view of the foregoing parallels from Horace himself and elsewhere, it would seem that the words "exstructis in altum divitiis," "riches piled into the deep," are a bold expression for "thy costly mansion by the sea." The interpretation is supported by the scholium of Acro "<EXSTRUCTIS> IN ALTUM DIVITIIS] mari iactis operibus et exstructis in altum aedificiis" (ATV).

ANDREW RUNNI ANDERSON

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

TIBULLUS ii 6. 8: ADDENDUM

A striking example of the Roman soldier's use of his helmet to carry water,¹ is to be found in Plutarch's *Life of Antony*, XLVII. On that occasion, when Antony determined to take the mountain path, which was without water (*ἀνδρίαν ἔχουσαν*), he ordered his soldiers to carry water with them (*ὕδωρ ἐπιφέρεισθαι*); most of them, however, lacking vessels, filled their helmets (some used skins) and carried the water thus (*διὸ καὶ τὰ κράνη πμ-πλάντες ὕδατος ἐκόμζον*).

MONROE E. DEUTSCH

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

¹ *Classical Philology*, IX, 447.

THE ARCHON PHILOCRATES

Philodemus relates that the philosopher Polemo died in the archonship of Philocrates.¹ The entry "Polemo filosofus moritur post quem Archesilas et Crates clari habentur" is found in Eusebius under ol. 126, 3 or 126, 4; in Hieronymus in M under 127, 2; in APF, under 127, 3; in R, under 127, 4; in the remainder of the manuscripts, under 128, 1.² If we combine these two sources we may date the archon Philocrates in 274/3, 273/2, 271/0, 270/69, 269/8, or 268/7 B.C. We cannot allow Polemo so much latitude in the choice of the year of his death, but it is a difficult matter to decide which, if any, of these dates is correct. So little confidence has been put in the chronicles of Eusebius-Hieronymus in matters of chronology that their statements have not been accepted as evidence unless confirmed by other sources. For example, the death of Zeno in all the manuscripts of Hieronymus is placed in 264/3, though it is now established that he died in 262/1.³ In the Armenian version of Eusebius the discrepancy is even greater, for this item is recorded under 270/69 or 269/8 B.C. Some of the manuscripts agree in placing the death of Polemo and Zeno four years apart,⁴ and if they are correct in the relative position of these events, we may establish the year 266/5 as another possibility for the death of Polemo. Such a method of reasoning must not be accepted unless it can be proved that all the items in this period vary in the same proportion. Unfortunately the history of the reign of Antigonus Gonatas still offers many chronological problems and very few of the items recorded in Eusebius for that reign can be checked. We shall have to find other evidence to help us determine the correct date of the death of Polemo.

The date of Philocrates may also be determined by means of the secretary-cycle, for inscriptions are preserved which show that the secretary in his archonship came from Demetrias or the second tribe in the official order.⁵ Unfortunately the cycles for the first half of the third century are almost as numerous as the manuscripts of Hieronymus and vary quite as much, or perhaps we should say, they are equally corrupt—so much so that

¹ *Acad. Phil. Ind.*, col. Q 4 ff., Mekler, p. 58.

² Jacoby, *Apollodorus Chronik*, 343.

³ On the date of Arrheneides in whose archonship Zeno died see Kolbe, *Abhandlungen der königl. Gesellsch. der Wiss. zu Göttingen*, Band X, No. 4, p. 40; Kirchner, *BPW* (1909), 844 ff.; Mayer, *Philologus*, LXXI, 226 ff.; cf. *AJP* (1913), 381 ff. Ferguson followed by Tarn (*Antigonus Gonatas*, 306) dates Arrheneides in 262/1 (*Priests of Asclepius*, 154).

⁴ In Eusebius, NZ; in Hieronymus, all but MAPFR (Jacoby, *op. cit.*). The arrangement of the items in the edition of Eusebius by Schoene led me to make the incorrect statement in *CP* (1914), 262, that the death of Zeno was ascribed to 266/5 B.C. The statements concerning the evidence for the date of Philocrates should be corrected and brought into conformity with that given in the text above.

⁵ *IG. ii.*² 684, 685.

scholars have as yet given unqualified approval to no one of them. Ferguson, Beloch, Kolbe, Pomtow, Tarn, and myself have constructed different cycles. In dating Philocrates, Ferguson, Kirchner, and Tarn follow one group of the manuscripts of Hieronymus,¹ Kolbe and Pomtow another,² choosing always the date which suits their arrangement of the cycle. Beloch could not make his theory fit any manuscript tradition and so had the courage to disregard it.³ I have been guilty of doing the same thing, though there is some warrant for dating Philocrates in 266/5 B.C. if we consider the relative dates of the deaths of Zeno and Polemo as recorded in the majority of the manuscripts.⁴ A new combination of two Attic inscriptions (*IG. ii.*² 684 and 752b) gives welcome confirmation of this theory.⁵ Unfortunately the two stones are so badly broken that the body of the decree is almost completely lost. We learn, however, that ambassadors came to Athens from Tenedos in the archonship of Philocrates and they were praised by public decree. Now Tenedos, as all the Aegean Islands, was under the jurisdiction of Ptolemy in 268 B.C., and Athens was subject to Antigonus.⁶ An official embassy from Tenedos could not be welcomed in Athens without giving mortal offense to Antigonus, and in 268 Athens was not prepared to do that. The decree must therefore belong to some period when Athens was independent of Macedon and friendly to Ptolemy. In other words, we must date the archon Philocrates at some time after the outbreak of the Chremonidean War or between 267 and 262 B.C.⁷ A closer approximation may be obtained from the evidence of *IG. ii.*² 685. In this decree the taxiarchs received the official thanks of the state. We must conclude from this that Athens was at war, and since she could praise her captains the campaign for that year could not have been wholly unsuccessful. This can only be said of the first year of the Chremonidean War when Athens was supported by Egypt and her other allies, and the offensive campaign of Antigonus was temporarily paralyzed by the revolt of his Gallic mercenaries at Megara.⁸ The mutineers were finally cut to pieces by the Macedonian troops, but the campaign for that year was ended. Next year the Spartans suffered a crushing defeat at Corinth and their king Areus was killed.⁹ The Peloponnesian allies gave no further support to Athens, and since Egypt had already withdrawn her fleet she was left to carry on the unequal contest alone. In the remaining years of the war Athens was

¹ Ferguson, "Priests of Asklepios," *University of California Publications*, I, No. 5; Kirchner, *Ins. Gr.* II and III, ed. min. Tarn. *op. cit.*, 415 ff.

² *Klio* (1914), 267-69. Apparently Kolbe has abandoned his original position where he dated Philocrates in 268/7 B.C. See note 3, p. 457.

³ *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 2, 32-61.

⁴ Tarn, *op. cit.*, 105, 106, 290.

⁵ *CP* (1914), 248 ff.

⁷ *CP* (1914), 276.

⁸ Wilhelm, *AM*, XXXIX, 315.

⁹ Justin, xxvi. 2.

⁶ Trogus, xxvi. The date of Areus' death (Diodorus xx. 29) is determined by Eduard Meyer by inclusive reckoning and placed in 266/5 B.C. (*Forschungen*, II, 510).

practically in a state of siege, and had no occasion to honor her commanders for their success in the field. Only the priests who performed sacrifices for safety now received the praise of the state.¹

Philocrates must therefore be dated within the period of the Chremonidean War and preferably in the first year's campaign. The evidence of Hieronymus and the inscriptions support the date 266/5 B.C., and if our secretary-cycle places Philocrates in that year, it is reasonable to suppose that both cycle and date are correct. Any cycle which places Philocrates before the alliance of Athens and Ptolemy, or before the beginning of the Chremonidean War must now be rejected as impossible.

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON

PRINCETON, N.J.

¹ *IG. II.*² 670, 674, 676, 689.

BOOK REVIEWS

Les Civilisations préhelléniques dans le bassin de la Mer Égée. Deuxième édition revue et augmentée; avec 325 gravures et 18 planches hors texte, dont cinq en couleurs. By RENÉ DUSSAUD. Paris: Librairie Paul Geuthner, 1914. Pp. x+482. Fr. 24.

This beautiful new edition of M. Dussaud's *Civilisations préhelléniques* is no mere reprint of the first. The subject-matter is augmented by one-half; the list of full-page engravings is increased from four to eighteen, five of them beautifully colored; certain chapters, like those on Troy, Mycenae, and Tiryns, that were abbreviated to a fault in the first edition, have been expanded to twice their former length and greatly improved. The chapter on the Aegean influence in Egypt and in Syria is a welcome addition. Various plans and tables, notably the comparative chronological table of the Aegean civilizations, and a full index enhance the convenience and the usability of the book.

The scope of the work is most clearly seen in the title-headings of its eight chapters: "Prehellenic Crete," "The Cyclades," "Troy and the Troad," "Continental Greece and the Mycenaean Civilization," "Cyprus," "The Aegean Influence in Egypt and Syria," "Cults and Myths," "The Aegean Peoples."

M. Dussaud has put together in convenient and readable form the results of the excavations of Arthur Evans at Cnossus; Harriet Boyd-Hawes and her fellow-laborers at Gournia, Vasiliki, etc.; Dörpfeld at Troy; Schliemann at Troy, Mycenae, Tiryns, Orchomenus, etc.; Seager at Mochlos; Edith Hall at Sphoungaras; Halbherr at Phaestus; Edgar and Atkinson at Phylakopi; and the Greek archaeologists in all parts of Hellas. English, German, Italian, and American, as well as French, discoveries and the literatures bearing on the subject are given full recognition. He accepts practically all of Dörpfeld's results at Troy, Tiryns, Triphylian Pylus; but the great German's Leucas-Ithaca is rejected, without arguments, in favor of the traditional names of the Ionian Islands. It seems like a rather trivial effort to cherish a "different opinion," when he corrects Dörpfeld's round numbers (which can be only approximate and make no pretensions at being anything else) from 2500-2000 B.C. to 2400-1900 B.C., and 2000-1500 B.C. to 1900-1400 B.C., as the respective dates of the second and third to fifth cities on the site of ancient Troy.

The history of those prehistoric ages is presented to us, not so much through traditions handed down by the later times as through the contemporary documents that by the discoveries of the last few decades have multiplied many times the knowledge we had of them a quarter of a century ago.

The book contains but little in the way of original contribution to the science of pre-Hellenic antiquities; but M. Dussaud does give, in clear, well-arranged, and attractive form, a résumé of all that has thus far been contributed to our knowledge of the civilizations of the Mediterranean basin. He presents the facts of art and archaeology and anthropology and discusses the various theories that have been brought forth, choosing, when the theories clash, the one that seems to him to be the most probable. His choice is usually sane; but, when (pp. 453, 454, for example) he identifies the Schardina (Sherden) of the Egyptian records with the "people of Sardinia," he fails altogether to note their probable identification with the Sardinians—a theory that receives exceptional support from their association with the Sicilians (cf. Breasted, *History of Egypt*, pp. 440, 462, 477, *et passim*).

The enormous literature, English, French, German, Greek, and Italian, that has grown up about the Minoan-Mycenaean civilization of the Mediterranean has all been read and thoroughly digested by the author; he has apparently visited and studied on the ground all the great seats of Minoan civilization and speaks with the clearness and vividness of personal autopsy. Only rarely does he swerve from absolute accuracy of statement, as, for example, p. 191, where we are told that in the palaces of Crete we have access from one room to another only by means of a simple door or *un couloir très court*; and yet a hallway like the west corridor at Knossos, 230 feet long, or even the east corridor, 75 feet long, can hardly be designated as *très court*. The bird reproduced in Fig. 176 is most obviously not a *poule d'eau* but a vulture or a turkey-buzzard. And the accepted date of the purification of Delos is not 425 (p. 97) but 427–426.

The book, with its rich illustrative material and its beautiful paper and type, presents a very attractive appearance. But unfortunately it is marred by carelessness in the proofreading. Not to mention omitted periods (for example, at the bottom of p. 69) and dislocated hyphens (for example, pp. 18, 22, 26, 29, and 31), p. 44 closes with the end of a paragraph while p. 45 opens with the middle of a detached sentence which has no beginning. Much more serious, however, is the lack of care in the verification of references and citations: for example, for Fig. 286 and Fig. 299 (p. 154) we should read Fig. 287 and Fig. 300; for Fig. 182 (p. 256) read Fig. 183; for Fig. 205 (p. 289) read Fig. 206; for Fig. 265 (p. 362 *infra*) read Fig. 266; similar errors abound; and some erroneous citations (for example, p. 416, n. 4; Fig. 187 and Fig. 286, p. 430) I have not been able to run down at all.

M. Dussaud's work is invaluable both to the student or teacher who may have a general interest in Mycenaean antiquities and to the specialist

in those fields. It does, though in briefer and more compact form, for the whole wide field what Schuchhardt's book did for Schliemann's excavations; not only is the entire field covered, but the whole literature of the subject is presented in the citations.

WALTER MILLER

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

Omphalos. Eine philologisch-archäologisch-volkskundliche Abhandlung über die Vorstellungen der Griechen und anderer Völker vom "Nabel der Erde." Von W. H. ROSCHER. Leipzig, 1913. Pp. 140; 9 plates. M. 8. (From Vol. XXIX of the *Abhandlungen der Sächs. Ges. der Wiss.*)

In this monograph the veteran mythologist offers an elaborate investigation of the myths, cults, and monuments of the Greeks which have to do with the idea of a "navel of the earth," and illustrates them with numerous parallels drawn from the folk-lore of other peoples, civilized and savage.

The first chapter treats of the etymology of ὀμφαλός and *umbilicus*, and of the different applications of these words; then (pp. 12-19) discusses the significance of the navel in various superstitious practices. The examples drawn from modern Greek folk-lore are of particular interest. In the second chapter Roscher shows that the idea of a definite place being the actual physical center of the world is a widespread one, occurring among people in lower as well as in higher stages of culture. He has not overlooked the part played in these beliefs by local pride (pp. 35, 132); but the humorously inclined American reader may miss a reference to Holmes's *Autocrat* (chap. vi), with its memorable witticisms about "the hub of the solar system," and the axis of the earth which "sticks out visibly through the center of each and every town or city."

In the third chapter, Roscher elaborates a theory which he had stated more succinctly elsewhere, to the effect that in the seventh and sixth centuries the ancient sanctuary of Apollo at Branchidae laid claim to the possession of the center of the earth. He explains the words ἐπὶ ἄζονος καθήμενη, used by Iamblichus of the prophetess of Branchidae (*De Mysteriis*, 3. 11, p. 127 P.), as meaning "sitting on an omphalos." Representations of an omphalos are seen upon coins of Miletus and its colonies Cyzicus and Sinope (pp. 47-53). Roscher believes, however, that the real "earth-navel" at Branchidae was the χάσμα γῆς from which the prophetic spring arose, while the omphalos in the conventional sense, the rounded cone of stone, was only a mark for the sacred spot.

Chap. iv, the longest of the work, some fifty pages, contains an exhaustive discussion of Delphi and its oracle as the center of the world, and of the Delphic omphalos. The literary evidence is not merely noted, but cited,

as a rule, in full; then follows an enumeration of representations of the omphalos in plastic form, and on wall-paintings, vases, and coins. The thoroughness of the list, together with the excellent plates, makes the chapter a very valuable archaeological essay.

The author discusses more briefly certain other cults of Apollo and Asclepius, apparently free from Delphic influence, in which omphaloi occur, and passes (chap. vi) to the subject of sepulchral monuments, baetyls, and altars, in the form of the omphalos. Here we are at once on debated ground. Roscher attacks the theory briefly set forth by Rohde, and most elaborately defended by Miss Harrison, that the omphalos was originally a representation of a grave-mound, perhaps the reputed grave of the Python, and that its significance as the world-center is secondary. Having shown in chap. ii that the idea of a world-center may be associated with rudimentary religious and social conditions, he does, beyond question, make it probable that the interpretation of the omphalos as the middle point of the world is of considerable antiquity; in fact, we have it attested as early as Pindar, while the view that the Delphic omphalos was a tomb is not found before Varro. Furthermore, Roscher is right in his criticism of several of Miss Harrison's arguments, as for instance, when he denies the connection of *ὀμφαλός* with *ὀμφή*. But for all that, we do not feel that he has put Miss Harrison's ingenious theory completely out of court. It is not easy to believe with Roscher (p. 121; cf. pp. 68, 77) that Varro's explanation of the omphalos as a tomb is founded merely upon some geographer's, or philosopher's protest against the claim of Delphi to be the center of the world. The firm belief that the spirits of the dead could foretell the future from their underground abodes would favor the development of an oracle upon the site of an ancient tomb—the identity of the occupant of the tomb is not important; and Varro's explanation may rest upon a tradition about an obsolete method of divination, superseded, like others, by the Apolline inspiration. As Roscher freely admits, certain omphalos monuments bear a close resemblance to representations of funeral mounds. Is it not possible that two influences, the sanctity of ancient tombs, and the custom of marking holy places, the religious centers of their communities, with peculiar monuments, co-operated to make the omphalos a thing of importance in cult and legend? Not enough allowance has been made in the study of ancient religions for the probability that complex originating factors have resulted in a single observed phenomenon.

In minor matters, this admirable work leaves little to criticize. I am not convinced by Roscher's view (pp. 51 f., 75, n. 136) that the \odot -like object, a dot or boss within a circle, shown on the gable of Apollo-temples, is an omphalos *in orbe terrarum*. It seems better to regard it as a *φιάλη ὀμφαλωτή*, a vessel which appears to have a special and significant connection with the mantic god. Again, the omphalos in connection with Asclepius (p. 113), seems to me best explained as a reminder that the cult of this god

had its origin in chthonic hero-worship—the omphalos being thus once more a tomb.

The printing is in general excellent. But *mens aut for meus ante* in the quotation from Ovid on p. 70 is particularly disturbing. And why, in a publication on which expense has not been spared, should an author feel obliged to use such ugly abbreviations as “δ.,” “δ-οί,” to save printing a Greek word in full?

CAMPBELL BONNER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Sophocles.¹ With an English Translation by F. STORR. In 2 vols. London: William Heinemann; New York: Macmillan, 1912. Pp. 15+419; 491.

Whatever pranks it may be permissible to play with Euripides, the translator of Sophocles must ever ἐπαίδειν ἑαυτῷ the self-admonition of Pater's ideal scholar, “I am utterly purposed that I will not offend.” Mr. Storr's version meets this test. There is a certain proportion of hardly avoidable conventionality and commonplace. But there are few lines, and, I think, no pages, unless possibly in some untranslatable choric ode, that will make to wince the reader who carries the original in his heart. And the English reader, however far short he may come of full realization of the blended subtleties, sonorities, and splendors of the Greek, at least receives some consistent and harmonious impression of Sophoclean unity, grace, beauty, dignity, elevation, and calm. This is in itself so considerable an achievement that I am not careful to inquire whether Mr. Storr is an English poet in his own right. He is clearly the best-equipped translator who has undertaken this particular task. He not only does not misconstrue (a thing which ought to, but does not, go without saying), but he possesses the long and loving familiarity with his author which enables him to feel, and usually to reproduce, the true emotional tone, the dramatic logic, the rhetorical coloring, the idiomatic turn, and the right rhythmic emphasis of the original. His diction is pure, vigorous, generally sustained at a sufficiently high poetical level, and enriched but not obtrusively overloaded with discreet reminiscences of the English Bible, Shakespeare, Milton—and Jebb. The blank verse, though not modulated with the art of the masters, is rarely pompous or flat or mechanical. It moves with fluency, ease, and some measure of equable distinction, and in the great passages follows not unsuccessfully the evolution of the long Greek poetic period. The sobriety and

¹ This review was written two years ago, and withheld from publication because the coolness with which this translation has been received by the majority of reviewers led me to distrust the excess of my own admiration. The late Jules Lemaitre lamented that literary criticism can never be a science, because we cannot re-read our entire library every morning. On re-reading this translation I find enough tame and commonplace lines to explain the prevailing estimate, but not enough to alter my own.

quiet beauty of the rhymed choral lyrics may at first disappoint readers who demand the impossible, a reproduction in English of the Sophoclean reconciliation of these qualities with the surge and swell of swift, triumphant harmonies and the passion and poignance of heaven-soaring song. Mr. Storr, though he has obviously read his Swinburne (*O.T.* 160 and 168), judiciously renounces the attempt to recapture these incommunicable raptures by parodies of Atalanta in Calydon. The Swinburnian anapaest, even in the hands of its cleverest manipulator, achieves a few brilliant successes at the cost of still more conspicuous disasters. Its metrical exigencies sometimes drive Swinburne himself, and inevitably constrain the translator, to diffuseness, inversion, impropriety of diction, and straining of idiom, with effects possibly Euripidean but certainly not Sophoclean. Mr. Storr secures the indispensable variety of movement and some approximation to the swift changes and nice adaptations of Greek lyric, first by a judicious mixture of trochaic and iambic rhythms, and secondly and chiefly by skilful employment of the traditional art of the English ode in the alternation, the correspondencies, and the interlocking symmetries of longer and shorter lines. This of course sometimes degenerates into the arbitrary and mechanical segmentations of so-called *vers libre*. Mr. Storr's relative success is due to the apparently unforced coincidence of the poetic with the rhythmical phrase and his instinctive adaptation of both to the rhythm and phrase of the original, which he evidently feels rightly in the Greek. In spite of this, the choruses are naturally less successful on the whole than the dialogue. The anapaestic Colonus ode is good, but not so good as Jebb's prose. The rendering of Arnold's favorite chorus in the *Oedipus Rex* 863 f.,

My lot be still to lead
The life of innocence and fly
Irreverence in word or deed, etc.

is tolerable, but we prefer to read it in Arnold's own version. More successful, perhaps, because less ambitious, are such things as the rendering of

εἶπν ὄθι δαίμων,
Oh when the flying foe,

with the echo of *τελεῖ τελεῖ Ζεὺς τι κατ' ἄμαρ* by

To-day, to-day Zeus worketh some great thing,

the similar echo in the first song of the chorus seeking Oedipus (*O.C.* 123)

A wayfarer I ween,

and the last dirge for Oedipus (*O.C.* 1568 ff.):

Queen infernal, and thou fell
Watch-dog of the gates of hell,
Who, as legends tell, dost glare,
Gnarling in thy cavernous lair
At all comers, let him go

Scathless to the fields below.
 For thy master orders thus,
 The son of earth and Tartarus;
 In his den the monster keep,
 Giver of eternal sleep.

But the choral odes are untranslatable, as Fitzgerald knew when he omitted them from his *Agamemnon*. Mr. Storr is inspired to his best work by the great eloquent *ῥήτραις* which are too long to quote in full. Here is Electra's recognition of the Paidagogus (1354):

O happy day! O sole deliverer
 Of Agamemnon's house, how cam'st thou hither?
 Art thou indeed our saviour who redeemed
 From endless woes my brother and myself?
 O hands beloved, O messenger whose feet
 Were bringers of glad tidings, how so long
 Couldst thou be with me and remain unknown,
 Stay me with feigned fables and conceal
 The truth that gave me life? Hail, father, hail!
 For 'tis a father whom I seem to see.
 Verily no man in the self same day
 Was hated so and so much loved as thou.

Here is the passage that Fitzgerald could never read without tears (*O.C.* 608):

Dear son of Aegeus, to the gods alone
 Is given immunity from eld and death;
 But nothing else escapes all-ruinous time.
 Earth's might decays, the might of men decays,
 Honour grows cold, dishonour flourishes,
 There is no constancy 'twixt friend and friend,
 Or city and city; be it soon or late,
 Sweet turns to bitter, hate once more to love.
 If now 'tis sunshine betwixt Thebes and thee
 And not a cloud, Time in his endless course
 Gives birth to endless days and nights, wherein
 The merest nothing shall suffice to cut
 With serried spears your bonds of amity.

And here, in part, is Oedipus' final curse upon his sons (*O.C.* 1354):

Didst thou not drive me, thine own father, out
 An exile, cityless, and make me wear
 This beggar's garb thou weepest to behold,
 Now thou art come thyself to my sad plight?
 Nothing is here for tears; it must be borne
 By me till death, and I shall think of thee
 As of my murderer; thou didst thrust me out;
 'Tis thou hast made me conversant with woe,

Through thee I beg my bread in a strange land;
And had not these my daughters tended me
I had been dead for aught of aid from thee.

The skilful placing of the "thee's" and "thou's" here recalls the passage in Dryden's *Astraea Redux*, which stirs Mr. Saintsbury's enthusiasm:

How shall I speak of that triumphant day
When you renewed the expiring pomp of May?
A month that owns an interest in your name;
You and the flowers are its peculiar claim.
That star, that at your birth shone out so bright
It stained the duller's sun's meridian light,
Did once again its potent fires renew,
Guiding our eyes to find and worship you.

PAUL SHOREY

Horace: the Odes and Epodes. With an English translation by C. E. BENNETT. (Loeb Classical Library.) New York: Macmillan, 1914. Pp. xix+431. \$1.50.

There are many who read and loved the classics in their younger days who have rejoiced in the prospect the Loeb series offered of renewing a pleasure which owing to rusty vocabulary and syntax would otherwise have been too laborious. Of no other author is this more pre-eminently true than of Horace, and altogether Professor Bennett has succeeded admirably in giving such and other readers the help they need. The translation is on the one hand no word-for-word crib with complete disregard of English idiom (to the deluded Freshman *donum exitiale Minervae*), nor on the other a purely literary version to be read apart from the Latin. The translator has known how to put in practice his author's golden rule, and the result is a happy compromise between a translation and a commentary. Such renderings as "poets" for *Mercurialium virorum* (2. 17. 29) and "lonely" for *caelebs* (2. 15. 4) presuppose the juxtaposition of the text. In general the style is even and without affectation while adapting freely to its need a poetic vocabulary and order of words. It is characterized rather by saneness than originality. In this respect it is in pleasing contrast to Wickham's version. The outstanding blemish to my mind is an excessive use of "O" as a vocative prefix, as unidiomatic in Latin as in English. I have noted also an occasional overpreciseness in rendering the Latin tenses as in 1. 23. 5: "For it quivers in heart and limb, if in the wind the briar *has rustled* with its moving leaves." Examples of almost Horatian felicity are to be found on every page. Here are a chance few: "untaught to brook privation" (*indocilis pauperiem pati*), "in simple elegance" (*simplex munditiis*), "poet of Homeric flight" (*Maeonii carminis aliti*), "bluff admirals" (*navium saevos duces*), "girl-boy face" (*ambiguo vultu*). This last is from 2. 5, which I can refer to as a notably

good and tactful version of an ode omitted by Wickham—under the apt title "Not Yet!" These titles, by the way, are a commendable and helpful feature. The translation is complete except Epodes 8 and 12, of which the text is printed at the end. The only difficulty not solved in some way is *peritus Hiber* (2. 20. 19). I must abstain from any lengthy quotations, but the student will find a convincing solution of many troublesome passages and many vigorous phrasings of favorite odes.

Every reader will of course discover occasional lapses. "Heaven" to my mind would often be a better general equivalent for *deus* (as in 1. 18. 3) than "the god." Weak for the famous *vultus nimium lubricus aspici* seems "her face seductive to behold," and too prosaic the rendering of *ducta regum colla* (2. 12. 11) by "kings led by the neck." I could wish that for *pellitis* (2. 6. 10) another rendering might have been found than the time-worn "skin-clad," which never fails to bring down the class. "Gruesome" is inappropriate for *grave* in 1. 2. 5 and "craven" for *humilis* in 1. 37. 32; "savage" is misleading for *mare barbarum* (2. 19. 17), and "Haedus" is an unusual designation in English for the constellation of the Kid (3. 1. 28). The repetition of *ad arma* in 1. 35. 15 suggests the call itself, but it is awkward to punctuate "arouse the peaceable 'to arms, to arms!'" "Neither so dear as before nor surviving whole" will not throw much light on *nec carus aequae nec superstes integer* (2. 17. 7), and the reference of the pronouns in 3. 1. 34 "in their depths," and in 3. 3. 11 "among whom" is vague. "Where it rounds into Calabria's gulf" does not well translate the accusative of "result produced" in 1. 33. 16 (*curvantis Calabros sinus*).

As regards interpretation, even a commentator does not have to decide so many points as the conscientious translator, who is a scholar besides. Professor Bennett is both, and his decisions, even where one cannot agree with him, are interesting and worth consideration. The only positive mis-translation is "Argive" for *Argoo* in *Ep.* 16. 57. I may note, however, the following places where I have not been able to agree. In 1. 1. 3 "*upon* the racing car" is forced, and just below (6), "*to the very gods*" is spoiled by the article. The *sic* of the propempticon to Virgil (1. 3. 1) can hardly mean "so that thou shalt bring him safe," as explained in Professor Bennett's edition, an interpretation favored also by Gow. In 1. 16. 12 *Juppiter ipse* should be glossed by "the very sky" (as in 1. 1. 25), not by "Jupiter himself"—anger is worse than sword, shipwreck, fire, and tempest, says Horace—and below (15), "drawn from" is inaccurate for *desectam*. *Usque* in 1. 17. 4 means not "during all his stay" but "whenever occasion calls." Over-elaborate surely for *male dispari* (1. 17. 25) is "unsuited to his cruel way." Are we to class Professor Bennett as anti-suffrage and pro-temperance on the strength of his rendering *vina liques* in 1. 11. 6 by "Busy thyself with household tasks?" This can hardly be what Horace meant. In 1. 24. 11 the less usual and probable interpretation "entrusted to this mortal life, alas! on no such terms" is adopted. No difficulty is found in taking *currens*

with *aper* in *Ep.* 5. 28, "bristles like . . . a racing boar," and in *Ep.* 16. 34 *levis* does not mean "grown smooth with scales," I think, but sleek like a seal instead of shaggy like a goat. In *Ep.* 17. 51 we should have "washes" for "washed." Few will agree with the division of 1. 28 into two odes: "Death the doom of all" and "A petition for sepulture." An ode beginning *Me quoque* is inconceivable, whereas it is quite in Horace's manner to pass from general statements to a personal application in this way. Moreover, it would be quite extraordinary to have two odes in the same unusual meter-juxtaposed. The ode must be interpreted as a unit, and the version here presented, otherwise unusually successful, is in favor of such interpretation.

The text for the purposes of this series might well have been more conservative both in readings, and in orthography, notably in the case of words involving *vu* or *uu* which are always spelled *vo* and *uo* to the unnecessary confusion of the unwary. The variants are mainly those adopted by the translator in his school edition (1901) and are generally indicated at the foot of the page. I note a few of the more radical: *aliti* 1. 6. 2—perverse in the face of *Bruto duce* 2. 7. 2; *arto* 1. 12. 43 (*apto cum lare*)—the interpretation "with scanty store" is inexact, but "old homestead" for *avitus fundus* is good. *Occulle* (*ibid.* 45), an original emendation, seems purposeless. In 1. 38. 6 *cura* is read without good reason *Bentleii periculo*! Bentley is sponsor also for *occupat*, 2. 12. 28—(*quae* surely refers to *oscula*), and again in 2. 20. 13 for the needless *tutior*. In the unsolved passage, 3. 4. 9 f., *avio* is read in 9 and *Apuliae* kept in 10 (so also *Apulicum* in 3. 24. 4). Other less usual readings are *Pergameae*, 1. 15. 36; *ictibus*, 1. 25. 2; *ut*, 1. 31. 10; *duellis*, 3. 26. 1; *securesque*, 3. 26. 7; *tuque*, 4. 2. 49—referred to *trumphe*; *indomitus*, 4. 14. 20; *dictum* without *est* and *servat* for *servet*, *C.S.* 26 f.; *venena maga non*, *Ep.* 5. 87; *quod expediat*, *Ep.* 16. 15.

The book itself is more attractive than some others of the series in the arrangement of the dissimilar pages. Prefixed are a very slight account of the "life and works," a still slighter bibliography (in which the edition is curiously indicated by Roman numerals immediately following the title: "Nauck, C. W. Oden und Epoden XVII"), and a list of the meters showing divisions into feet according to Schmidt. There are a few meager footnotes and a rather perfunctory index which usually seems carefully to avoid giving an enlightening definition and does not always conform to the text: e.g., Megilla, Euhias. In general the series could be made much more useful and "worth the money" by better introductory matter and indices. Misprints are very few: p. 55, *of* for *or* (1. 17. 28); p. 108, misplaced comma in 2. 1. 37; p. 157, Attilus in footnote; p. 317, superfluous dieresis in Tyndareüs; and one or two other slight typographical slips.

WILLIS P. WOODMAN

HOBART COLLEGE

Cicero De officiis. With an English Translation by WALTER MILLER.
New York: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. 423. \$1.50.

Cicero. De finibus bonorum et malorum. With an English Translation by H. RACKHAM, M.A. New York: Macmillan, 1914.
Pp. 512. \$1.50.

The Loeb Classical Library offers in these volumes, one by an American, the other by an English scholar, two translations worthy of high commendation. Both translators, have adopted the fluent English style alone adequate for reproducing the copiousness of the original; both have for the most part succeeded in attaining an elegance and distinction of phrase indispensable in a translation of Cicero; both have paid due regard to clear-cut and consistent renderings of technical and quasi-technical terms, and, by marginal summaries, footnotes, modern paragraph division, and occasional use of numerals to mark subdivisions in the argument, have presented the subject-matter in as concise, orderly, and perspicuous a manner as is possible in works which sometimes fall short of perfectly logical and scientifically complete exposition. While individual tastes may differ as to what constitutes successful translation, it may be safely affirmed that these books both impress the reader with the intrinsic value of the subject-matter and afford abundant illustration of the art of translating Latin prose into current English, an art by no means lost, but still a *desideratum* in much of our contemporary classical instruction. A modern Roger Ascham would recommend them for practice in "retroversion."

The three books *On Moral Duties*, "the cap-sheaf of Cicero's ethical studies," were written, not as a contribution to strict scientific thinking, but as a solace to his distracted soul and a *vade mecum* for his son, a student at Athens. In spite of their practical wisdom, patriotic fervor, and personal interest, they are at times tedious and confused. Mr. Miller has a happy faculty of relieving the monotony of exposition by cleverly recasting cumbersome periods and, in a delightful yet legitimate way, adding to the phrase a certain piquancy and epigrammatic flavor. Mr. Miller may well have given renewed life to a work which, although almost the first ancient classic to be printed, has since become less popular as a textbook in ethics. The translator has made the edition of C. F. W. Müller (Leipzig, 1879) the basis of the text and makes due acknowledgment for helpful suggestions to Holden's commentary (Cambridge, 1891). There are few errata. The index is copious, useful, and, so far as I have tested it, accurate. Stricter uniformity might have been observed in the use of brackets in the translation so as to conform to their use in the text: e.g., i. 36-37, and 40. Sometimes parenthetic paraphrase creeps into the translation, instead of being relegated to a note: e.g., i. 108: *εἶπον*, "pretending to need information and professing admiration for the wisdom of his companions."

Mr. Rackham follows with minor changes the text of Madvig (1876). The apparatus shows a few emendations by the editor (ii. 37; iv. 35; v. 29, 38, 76) but for the most part preferred readings and conjectures from the notes of Madvig and other scholars constitute the textual changes. The introduction, largely devoted to a résumé of the Greek philosophical schools, is larger than is usual in the Loeb series and adds materially to the usefulness of the book. The index is brief but the references are not always reliable: e.g., Tantalus i. 60 is omitted; Themista ii. 67 (for 68); P. Scaevola iv. 78 (for 77); iv. 40 is indexed under both Aristo of Ceos and Aristo of Chios. In the translation, ii. 74, Torquatus is printed for Triarius. A few slips like Pomponius (p. xii) and Nichomachus (p. 404, note) have escaped the proofreader.

Cicero, while not an original philosophic thinker or even a penetrating critic of philosophy, was nevertheless a masterly writer on ethical subjects. The three dialogues *About the End of Goods and Evils* rank as his greatest achievement in the field of ethics, and have also an adventitious value, in that they are the only surviving systematic accounts of the Epicurean, Stoic, and Academic speculative ethics. They are written in a style, the torrential eloquence of which suits well the rapid thrust and parry of a heated debate. Mr. Rackham has caught the spirit of the scenes and sustains the liveliness and vigor of the argument to the end.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG

UNION COLLEGE
SCHENECTADY, N.Y.

The Piscatory Eclogues of Jacopo Sannazaro. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by WILFRED P. MUSTARD, PH.D. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1914.

Although Sannazaro is best known as the first explorer of the literary Arcadia, he was famous in his generation hardly less for his Latin poems, especially his Eclogues, which at once ranked him as a second Vergil. *Maroni Musa proximus*, wrote Bembo into his epitaph, and Julius Scaliger could say: *In carmine quoque pastorale solus legi dignus omnium qui post Vergilium scripsere.*

His distinction as a writer of eclogues was not due alone to the finished Latinity of his hexameters, but to his innovation of changing the setting of the eclogues from the land to the sea, investing the threadbare figures of the traditional pastoral in the fresh colors of fishermen who, environed by the shores and quiet waters of his own Posilipo, are made to talk not of flocks and herds, but of fish and nets and lobster-pots, and woo "not with apples or with roses," but with gifts of pearls, sea-urchins, and cockle-shells.

It is, however, only in externals that he breaks with the pastoral tradition. The masquerade is new, but through their thin disguise the old familiar Corydons and Lacons stand revealed by speaking from the pages of Theocritus, Vergil, and Nemesianus, and most of all from Vergil. His devotion to Vergil is evident everywhere. Indeed, to quote the clever phrase of a French critic, his characters are "des Sannazars parlant Vergile." Even the stock situations and themes of the Vergilian pastoral are used again. The first eclogue, the dirge, is like Vergil's fifth eclogue; the second, a lover's plaint, resembles Vergil's second; the third, the singing match, corresponds to Vergil's seventh; the fourth reproduces the Silenus song and its setting in Eclogue VI; and the fifth, the Pharmaceutria, closely follows the eighth eclogue of Vergil.

The change of the *mise-en-scène*, which was, perhaps, suggested to him by the sixth, eleventh, and especially the fisher-idyll of Theocritus, was sufficient to establish Sannazaro as the father of the marine eclogue. His own claim:

Nunc litoream ne despice Musam
Quam tibi post silvas, post horrida lustra Lycae
(Si quid id est) salsas deduxi primus ad undas,
Ausus inexperta tentare pericula cymba

stood unchallenged, and it became customary to link together the names of Theocritus, Vergil, and Sannazaro as the trinity which had determined the development of the eclogue as a literary form.

Professor Mustard's introduction deals at length with the popularity and influence of Sannazaro's *Piscatory Eclogues*. In Italy, they were often echoed and imitated, in Spain also, as in Portugal, and in France. Curiously enough, in England, where the pastoral took root and flourished as in no other country save Italy, they appear to have had less vogue; they were responsible for the *Piscatorie Eclogs* of Phineas Fletcher and the *Piscatory Eclogues* of Moses Brown, but no first-rate writer seems to have been touched by their influence except Milton, who almost certainly had the first eclogue before him when he wrote his *Lycidas*.

The text of the five eclogues is based on the first printed edition (Naples, 1526). There is besides a fragment of 42 lines taken from the "autograph" in the Vatican Library. The spelling and punctuation are changed to meet the convenience of the present-day reader. There are fifteen pages of admirable notes, explanatory, and illustrative of literary relations; and a good index.

Of the edition as a whole it is sufficient praise to say that it is in every way a worthy successor to the excellent edition of the *Eclogues of Mantuan*, published three years ago.

GEORGE NORLIN

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

Demosthenis Orationes. Edidit CAROLUS FUHR. Editio maior,
Volumen I. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. Pp. xxxi+535.
M. 4.50.

The Teubner text of Demosthenes has long been in need of a thoroughgoing revision. Blass's edition of 1884 embodied personal views that have not found general acceptance, some of which, indeed, the editor himself had materially changed before his death, some even as early as 1890, when he published his *Rede vom Kranze*. The most important of these views of Blass was his conviction that quotations from Demosthenes as found in Greek rhetoricians and grammarians often furnished a more ancient and reliable text than even the best MSS of the orator himself. Without sufficiently determining for each rhetorician whether or not he was accustomed to depend on memory for his quotations (a question that by no means admits a safe answer in some cases) and without sufficient critical apparatus for those authors, Blass ventured to make large use of these citations as evidence for the text of Demosthenes. The bad effects of this procedure needed to be eliminated from the Teubner text.

Again, Blass was so zealous in the application of the unquestioned principle of the avoidance of hiatus by Demosthenes, and the far less definite "rule" of the avoidance of a succession of three or more short syllables, that he frequently secured conformity to the principle and the rule by the acceptance of inferior manuscript testimony, and sometimes by pure conjecture. This procedure could not give a reliable text.

Still more serious was the damage wrought by Blass in the Teubner text by his attempt to secure in it the particular rhythmical movements and correspondences which at that time he believed he had discovered. The fact that he soon passed on to other rhythmical theories left his text of 1884 out of date even for himself, and in its use of rhythmical theory as a part of critical apparatus it met no acceptance whatever from other scholars.

In view of the great extent of the revision demanded, it is not surprising that Fuhr puts out the new text, not as a fifth edition of the old, but as a new work.

In his preface Fuhr briefly refers to the more recent discussions as to the original editions of Demosthenes' works and ancient revisions of them. He then gives in fifteen pages a description of the MSS, with references to the latest critical literature. He agrees with all scholars in holding S as of supreme authority, yet not infallible; he believes L to have been written from a MS that was itself a copy from S. A list of the papyrus fragments is added, with a brief statement of their small value as against the other MSS. He divides the MSS into three classes as against the four families of Butcher's Oxford text, for where Butcher makes P and Y members of a distinct family, Fuhr classes them with F. The plan of the Teubner texts allows Fuhr to give only brief critical notes. In ordinary cases he cites only the reading of

the leading member of each class, S, F, A; but under the sign V he often cites a reading on which F and Q agree. For the first four speeches, where A is only in small part available, because of its mutilation, he makes large use of U, citing from his own collation even insignificant variations and mistakes. He of course notes every variation of his own text from S, except in matters like elision and the *v* movable. He records conjectures of modern scholars to some extent.

As to quotations in the rhetoricians and grammarians, Fuhr reminds us of the possibility that an ancient author was quoting in any given case from memory, or intentionally changing the phraseology; further, that when he did quote from his own copy of Demosthenes, there is even greater danger of the corruption of the text of these writers as transmitted to us than of the older and better MSS of Demosthenes; and, finally, that for many of these writers we have as yet no critical editions. He concludes: "Quae cum ita sint, testimoniis illis non multum tribuo, multo minus sophistarum imitationibus, quippe quos oratoris verba cum se imitando oratorem superare posse confiderent saepe ipsos mutasse credam" (p. xxv). Fuhr therefore quotes such testimony only occasionally, except in the case of Didymus, Dionysius, and Hermogenes; these authors, available in critical editions, he cites regularly.

In matters of hiatus and groups of short syllables two classes of cases are to be distinguished: first, there are very many cases where the hiatus would be removed, or the series of *breves* broken up, by the use of ordinary elision, aphaeresis, crasis, the use of *v* movable (both before vowels and consonants), and especially by the marking of slight, but necessary, pauses. In another class of cases we have real hiatus or *breves*, removable only by alterations of the text that are more than formal. As to cases of the first class the editor of a critical text might take the position that these are cases to be managed in oral delivery, and that the printed text need not attempt to show these elisions, pauses, etc. Such an editor would content himself with printing the text of S *literatim* (except as to pauses). But no recent editor takes this position, for the usage of S as to elision and the *v* movable is so haphazard and inconsistent that it can claim no significance. We could not tolerate, e.g., such a text as S gives in 18. 197 σὺν δὲ οὐτε ἕτερα εἶπες (σὺν δ' οὐθ' ἕτερον εἶπες Fuhr), or in 18. 224 τότε δὲ αὐτὸ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἂν ἐκρίνετο ἐφ' αὐτοῦ (τότε δ' αὐτὸ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἂν ἐκρίνεται ἐφ' αὐτοῦ Fuhr), or in 18. 193 μὴ δὴ τοῦτο ὡς ἀδίκημα ἐμὸν θῆς . . . ὡς οὐχ ἅπαντα ὅσα ἐνὶν κατὰ ἀνθρώπινον λογισμὸν (μὴ δὴ τοῦθ' ὡς ἀδίκημα ἐμὸν θῆς . . . ὡς οὐχ ἅπανθ' ὅσ' ἐνὶν κατ' ἀνθρώπινον λογισμὸν Fuhr). Editors are agreed in holding S as of no authority in these matters, but they differ considerably in the extent to which they follow consistent principles of their own. With Fuhr's edition we naturally compare Goodwin's critical edition of the *De corona* (1901), Butcher's Oxford text (1903), which contains the same speeches as this first volume of Fuhr's (Speeches I-XIX), and Humphrey's *De corona* (1912), which, while not put

forth as a critical edition of the speech, gives in some respects the best text that we have. Goodwin seems to have given little attention to hiatus. He elides freely, beyond the elisions of S, but on no discernible principle; we find such needless cases of hiatus as ἀγῶνα Αἰσχίνου 3; πρᾶγμα αὐτὸ ἀναγκάζει and ἀγῶνα ἐνστυγνόμενος 4 (but ἀγῶν' ἐμοί 5); τε ἰδίων 8; θεάσασθε ὡς βεβίωκα ἤ κοινὰ ὑπέρευν καταψηφίσασθε ἦδη ἐνδέδειχε ἐπὶ 10. So inconsistent a text would be defensible only by an editor who was copying S throughout; this Goodwin does not do.

Butcher consistently elides to avoid hiatus; occasionally, however, where there is a distinct pause, yet a pause not sufficient in Butcher's judgment to warrant punctuation, he marks the pause by refraining from elision; some pauses of this sort are caused by the dwelling of the voice on an emphatic word (see Butcher's preface). The following are instances in the *De corona* (I have taken this speech for the more minute examination, as it is here that we have the editions of Goodwin and Humphreys for comparison): ἂ τὸτ' ὠνομάζοντο ἡνίκ' ἐδωροδόκουν 46; εἴτ' ἀληθῆ καὶ προσήκοντα εἶτε καὶ ψευδῆ 57; καὶ διὰ γε τοῦτο ὀρθῶς ἐπηνούμην 113; ἐφ' οἷς δ' ἐστεφανοῦτο οὐχ ὑπεύθυνος 117; τὸν δ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ γενέσθαι ταῦτ' ἀγῶνα ἕτεροι ἦσαν πεποιημένοι 201; ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦν ταῦθ', ὡς ἔοικε, τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις πάτρια οὐδ' ἀνεκτὰ οὐδ' ἔμφυτα 203 (ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦν ταῦθ' ὡς ἔοικεν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις πατρί' οὐδ' ἀνέκτ' οὐδ' ἔμφυτα Fuhr [ἔοικε Humphreys]). So ψήφισμα ἤ 85; ἡγάπησα ἀντί 109; ὑμέτερα ἐξ 177; συμβόλαια ἐπὶ 210; νομίζοντα οὐδέ 238; λεηλοῦργηκα ὑμῖν 267; ἐναντίωμαι ἤ 308; βοήθεια ἤ 311. Butcher seems to have overlooked the need of elision in πρᾶγμα αὐτ' 4; κοινὰ ὑπέρευν 10; τοῦτο ὀρθῶς 113. As to hiatus as a factor in estimating the value of variant readings, Butcher says, "Deteriori igitur codici hiatum respuenti libentius obtemperamus quam meliori recipienti." So in 18. 142 he reads οὗτος ἐλάττων ὑποληφθῆ with the vulgate, where S has ὑποληφθῆ οὗτος ἐλάττων, with hard hiatus. (Goodwin tolerates the hiatus; Humphreys and Fuhr agree with Butcher in adopting the otherwise inferior reading in order to avoid it.)

Humphreys seldom fails to avoid hiatus where it can be done by elision. I have noted only the following cases: τὸ πρᾶγμα αὐτ' 4; δίκαια εὐνοϊκῶς 7; βεβίωκα ἤ 10; τοῦτό γε ἐν 21; ὠνομάζοντο ἡνίκ' 46; ἡδίκησθε ἐν 100; ἔδωκα ὑπεύθυνος 117; διδόμενα ὁμολογῶν 119; συμβάντα ἐν 168; ἀγαθὰ εἰς 213; ἕκαστα ἐγὼ 214.

Fuhr consistently removes hiatus by elision. In the *Crown Speech* I have noted only these exceptions: γιγνόμενα ἐπὶ 64; ἡδίκησθε ἐν 100; ταῦτα ὡς 170; ἐποίησα Εὐβοίας 237; λεηλοῦργηκα ὑμῖν 267. In some of these cases there is sufficient pause to justify the hiatus. In three cases Fuhr removes hiatus by changing the order of words on inferior manuscript authority, or without authority: ἀγωνία πολλῇ for πολλῇ ἀγωνία of the MSS (S omits) 33; ἀπαρτᾶν ὑπολάβῃ (so Weil) for ὑπολάβῃ ἀπαρτᾶν of the MSS 59; τῇ πόλει λόγους ἐπαιρούμενος A (Butcher): τῇ πόλει ἐπαιρούμενος λόγους S, V, Y, Goodwin, Humphreys (222). On the other hand, in 12 Fuhr adopts an

interpretation that involves the bad hiatus αὐτῇ ἐχθροῦ, where Br. and Hs. with quite as good meaning have αὐτῇ· ἐχθροῦ. . . .

It is to be noted that Humphreys regularly leaves a vowel unelided before a comma, while Fuhr frequently elides, even where the pause is very distinct: Fuhr, τοὺτους μὲν ἐχθροὺς ὑπολήψεσθ', ἐμοὶ δὲ πιστεύετε 40; σχῆλιον γὰρ ἂν εἴη τοῦτό γ', εἰ τῷ . . . 114; πάνυ γὰρ παρὰ τοῦτ', οὐχ ὀρέας; γέγονεν τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, εἰ τοῦτ' ὁ βῆμ', ἀλλὰ μὴ τοῦτ' διελέχθην ἐγώ, ἢ δευρὶ τὴν χεῖρ', ἀλλὰ μὴ δευρὶ παρήνεγκα 232; εἰδίδασκες γράμματα', ἐγὼ δ' ἐφοίτων 265. It is hard to defend elision in cases like these; if the pause is sufficient to warrant the printed sign, it is certainly sufficient (in Demosthenic prose) to neutralize the hiatus.

Friedrich Schiller has recently put forth the hypothesis that in a considerable number of cases where the reading of S has hiatus that is avoided by the readings of other MSS the reading of S is correct, the others going back to a text that had been corrected by an editor for the express purpose of removing hiatus, but without an exact understanding of Demosthenes' usage ("Zu dem Hiate bei Demosthenes," *Festschrift d. Gymnas. zu Hirschberg*, 1912). The whole question needs a more thorough investigation. Zander's collection of cases of hiatus (*Eurythmia*, Leipzig, 1910, pp. 429-38) is useful.

As to Demosthenes' avoidance of *breves* there is no common consent among scholars. (I use the term *breves* in the restricted sense in which Blass has made it familiar, a group of three or more short syllables not immediately followed by a pause, and not lying entirely within a single word, unless the final syllable of the word is the final syllable of the group.) Is this avoidance of *breves* a "law" of Demosthenes' composition, a "rule" with more or less exceptions, or a mere tendency (perhaps almost unconscious)? Blass gave it such weight that he did not hesitate to adopt an inferior reading, and sometimes to alter the text outright, to avoid *breves*. Here, as in the case of hiatus, there are two classes of possible alterations: the first are merely formal, where the group of *breves* may be broken up by the elision of a vowel, by the use of *ν* movable before a consonant, by aphaeresis, or the substitution of one form of a given word for another (e.g., εἵνεκα for ἔνεκα, χρῆν for ἐχρῆν, τοσοῦτ[ο] for τοσοῦτον, αὐτοῦ for ἑαυτοῦ, ἡβουλόμην for ἐβουλόμην, μου for ἐμοῦ). Punctuation also will very often break up an apparent group of short syllables. Here it is often a question whether the pause that is clearly sufficient to lengthen the last syllable of a group is strong enough to warrant the use of a comma. This is particularly true when, as so often in the orators, the pause is rhetorical rather than syntactical; not infrequently the balance of *kola* or even of *kommata* demands so distinct a pause in delivery that it may well be marked for the eye of the reader. The rhetorical structure is so essential to the appreciation of a Greek speech that we may well use punctuation more freely than in other prose. Perhaps Blass, in his constant anxiety to avoid *breves*, punctuated too freely, but certainly Fuhr

goes too far in his reaction against this; in Fuhr's text we too often find apparent *breves* that would be broken up by a comma which is well justified on rhetorical, sometimes on syntactical, grounds. In this respect Humphreys gives the better text, avoiding both extremes, but usually alert for the removal of needless *breves*.

Fuhr's scrupulous use of elision to avoid hiatus keeps his text free from one class of needless *breves* that abound in Goodwin's text; e.g., Goodwin has πεπραγμένα ἐμαντῷ 4; τε ἰδίων 8; κοινὰ ὑπέρευ 10; ἐνδίδειχθε ἐπὶ 10; πράγματα ἐλέγχους 15; ὅσα ὑπέρ 17; ἃ τότε ὀνομάζοντο 46; ἔωρᾶτο ὑπὸ 93. But in the use of *v* movable Fuhr sometime disregards the question of *brr.*, often following the reading of S, though he admits that in this respect S has no authority. Blass had, by an entirely legitimate use of *-v*, removed a host of apparent *breves*; some of these reappear in Fuhr's text; so ἀπέκτεινέ με δικαίως 101; τοῖς γ' ὁμομοκόσι κατὰ τοῖς 121; τετελευτηκόσι παρ' αὐτά 285; ἀέθηκε δύναμιν 290. More numerous are the cases where *breves* are caused by Fuhr's use of *-v* to avoid hiatus, where he should have elided: ἐστίν ὁ τὰ θηβαίων 41; γέγονεν αἷτια 42; παρελήλυθεν ὁ τῶν 48; ἐπραττεν ἀδικῶν 69; γέγονεν οἶδα 70; ἐκβίβηκεν ἃ προείπατε 80; γέγραφεν οὐτοσί 223. In all these cases Humphreys avoids the *brr.* by elision, but both Humphreys and Fuhr fail to elide in the following: ἐτυχεν ἦν 130; προσέταξεν ἐτέρῳ 135; ἐπραξεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν 139; ἐποίησεν ἀπολέσθαι 142; ἐτύγχανεν ἔχον 174; γέγονεν οἶον 198. In the following cases Fuhr makes right use of *-v* (in each case following S) to avoid *brr.*, where Humphreys neglects it: Ἀμφικτύοσιν καί 147; Ἄμς φικτύοσιν δόξαντα 156; οὖσιν μερίδι 176; εἶχεν τὸ φρόνημ' 206; κατάρθρωσεν δι' ἐμοῦ 285. Butcher is very careful in this matter; the only oversights that I have noticed are ἔλεγε περί 111 (where S has ἔλεγεν περι), and Ἀμφικτύοσι καί 147.

In the choice of an alternative form of a word for the sake of avoiding *brr.* Fuhr seems to be indifferent, content to follow the reading of S. So he frequently writes ἔνεκα where Butcher and Humphreys change to εἵνεκα; e.g., δήποθ' ἔνεκα 21; μὲν ἔνεκ' ἂν εἰκότως 160; οὐπερ ἔνεκα τὰς 163; τίνος ἔνεκα ταῦτ' 172. So 173, 211, 248, 293. Fuhr writes ἀλλὰ τί ἐχρῆν 28, where Blass avoids the *brr.* by writing χρῆν. So the same phrase in 69, where Humphreys follows Blass in writing χρῆν. Fuhr has needless *brr.* in ἐκεῖνον ὕφ' ἑαντῷ (αὐτῷ Bl., Hs.) 40; Ἑλλήσποντον ὕφ' ἑαντῷ (αὐτῷ Bl., Br., Hs.) 71; καταφεύγοντας ἐφ' ἑαντούς (αὐτούς Bl.) 97. In 64 Fuhr writes πόλιν ἐβούλετ' ἂν (ἡβούλετ' Bl.). In 52 πότερον ὑμῖν is well changed to πότερ' ὑμῖν by Bl. and Hs., though Humphreys fails, with Fuhr, to make the same change in πότερον αὐτήν (αὐτήν Bl.) 63.

It is clear in all these instances that Fuhr has not enough confidence in the theory that Demosthenes generally avoids *breves* to warrant making even formal changes in the text of S; he thus takes a reactionary position as compared with that of Butcher and Humphreys. This seems hardly consistent with his words in the preface (p. xxvi), "Brevium autem syllabarum

frequentationem Demosthenem fugisse Blassius ille quidem optime demonstravit" That, as Fuhr says, it is likely that Demosthenes sometimes did use *breves* intentionally, "ut vivacior fieret oratio et incitatio," remains to be proved—I know of no evidence of it. Certainly in the "lively" narrative of the Elateia passage in the *Crown Speech* there is no case of *breves* (168-70 inclusive), but in the emphatic discussion of the significance of the events, which immediately follows, there are more cases than is usual in the same number of lines; exactly the opposite of what Fuhr would lead us to expect.

In many cases the removal of *breves* would involve more than formal changes in the text. Here undoubtedly Fuhr is right, with Butcher and Humphreys, in refusing to follow Blass in emending the text in order to remove the *breves*; and until we have a much-needed investigation of the range of Demosthenes' avoidance of *breves*, Fuhr and the other editors since Blass are right in refusing to give weight to this consideration even in deciding between variant readings of the MSS. On the whole, Humphreys has given us the text that most closely conforms to what we actually know about Demosthenes' avoidance of *breves*; Butcher comes next.

Fuhr, with Butcher and Humphreys, rightly refuses to give any weight to considerations of "Demosthenic rhythm" in establishing the text. The whole question is an open one; it is doubtful whether any one of the theories that have been offered in recent years furnishes even the first step toward a solution.

I have dwelt at length on these formal characteristics of the new Teubner text because it is in this field that Fuhr has departed entirely from some of the principles of his predecessor. Turning to the question of Fuhr's attitude toward the manuscript tradition in essential matters, we find him in substantial agreement with all recent editors; he is even more conservative than Butcher, seldom rejecting a reading of S that can possibly be retained. He uses brackets in the text very cautiously, usually on safe grounds; the larger number of his brackets are based on the conjectures of other scholars. Fuhr introduces few conjectures of his own. The critical notes contain rather more material than those of the Oxford text.

CHARLES D. ADAMS

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

Inscriptiones Graecae. By O. KERN. Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1913. M. 6.

In publishing this selection of photographic reproductions, Kern has in mind those students of Greek epigraphy who read the pages of Dittenberger's *Sylloge* without having any idea of the appearance of the documents in their original state. Unfortunately many of the photographs which he had secured could not be used. This probably accounts for the lack of proper-

tion in some cases. While most of the epichoric alphabets are illustrated, eight inscriptions from Thera and a small portion only of the Gortynian law code are given. Delphi has been omitted while nine stones from Tegea have been included. Lemnos is represented by a document which is not certainly known to be Greek. The various classes of inscriptions from Attica are well represented in a series of forty-eight photographs, though unfortunately the retrograde and boustrophedon methods of writing are not included, nor any inscription of the Christian era. Coins have been excluded as in the *IG*, but pottery has been used to illustrate the alphabets of Megara and Corinth.

The Hekatompedon inscription (No. 13) shows very clearly some of the problems of the epigraphist in assembling scattered fragments preparatory to the more difficult task of restoration. Very few scholars would agree with Kern in dating this inscription in the middle of the sixth century. The ravages inflicted by man and time are well seen on Nos. 20 and 26. The cuttings for the door-post in the latter serve to show what must have been the fate of many Greek inscriptions.

Kern's excellent book cannot be used as a textbook because of its limited range, nor can it in any sense displace the works of Roehl, Roberts, or Dittenberger. It does serve to supplement these, however, and in the classroom it will undoubtedly be found useful in promoting the students' interest in epigraphical studies.

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Griechische Epigraphik. Müllers Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. By W. LARFELD. Erster Band, 5. Abteil., 3. Aufl. München: Beck, 1914.

The third edition of the section on Greek epigraphy in Müller's *Handbücher* by Larfeld is an abridgment of the latter's *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik* which appeared in two volumes in 1902 and 1907. Much of the huge mass of formulae and the detailed plates of letter-forms which comprised the bulk of Vol. II, published in 1902, have been eliminated in the new edition, which has also been brought abreast of the advance in this department of language in recent years.

Larfeld still insists that the typed facsimiles in *Inscriptiones Graecae* are quite satisfactory as a means of studying the development of the Attic alphabet. One might as well write a dissertation on the characteristics of handwriting based on a study of the type in our daily papers. The student of epigraphy who has no opportunity of seeing the original documents can gain an intimate and accurate knowledge of the development of letter-forms only by a study of squeezes or photographs. Kern's excellent little book will do much in this direction. Better still, Kirchner promises to issue in

convenient form photographic reproductions of the documents in the Epigraphical Museum at Athens. These plates will be the ultimate resource for those of us who cannot study inscriptions from the original texts.

Larfeld gives a sketch of the history of Greek epigraphy from the earliest times down to the present day. A comparison of this with the same section in the second edition shows to some extent the great activity in this branch of classical study during the last twenty-two years. Certainly no other field, with the possible exception of papyrology, has been so productive, not only in itself, but also in the closely allied department of history.

In the second part Larfeld discusses the material, cost, officials in charge of publication, place of dedication, etc. The question might be raised as to the location of all the documents found on the Acropolis at Athens. The cuttings in the native rock could have accommodated only a tithe of the total number. Most of the decrees show the back of the stone roughly finished, and they must have been placed where only the front could be seen. Possibly many were set up along the walls of the Acropolis.

The chapter dealing with the fate of inscriptions is most interesting. In some cases the Athenians destroyed or erased portions of decrees by legislative enactment. The ravages of war by Greeks, Romans, Goths, Slavs, Bulgarians, Normans, Franks, Venetians, and Turks destroyed in turn the ancient monuments and records. Early Christianity was equally culpable with fanatical Mohammedanism in the work of destruction. When the glory of Greece was in eclipse and forgotten, the peasant found that the Attic decrees were very convenient for doorsteps or pavement blocks, or, if mortar were needed, the state archives yielded excellent material for the lime-kiln. Even at the present day not a few inscriptions are broken into pieces by the peasant who, in his ignorance, believes that the mystic letters indicate treasure hidden within. On the other hand, the fact that these stones make good building material has been the means of saving hundreds of documents which might otherwise have perished. Many are still imbedded in the walls of the Acropolis and dwellings of Athens. In 1911 ten were found in a small foundation wall near the Propylaea. The history of some of the documents cannot be charged as uninteresting. A fragment of the Erechtheum building-inscription was used to fortify Athens in the Greek struggle for independence. The fragment has long since disappeared from view but the impression in the mortar remains and is legible. Another fragment was found by the English traveler, Chandler, and purchased from the owner. In order to make the stone more portable, he intrusted it to a stonecutter to chip away the back, which was still covered with cement. Mr. Dinsmoor has recently discovered that the stone was opisthographic, and that the distinguished traveler was thus guilty of unconscious vandalism.

The secretary-cycle is not mentioned as a means of dating Attic inscriptions, though Larfeld is apparently aware of Ferguson's researches. Whatever

may be the differences between the cycles constructed by Ferguson or his critics, all are fully agreed upon the existence of some form of tribal rotation in the third and second centuries. Secondly, in his directions for publishing a newly discovered text Larfeld fails to mention the best and most accurate way of reproducing the inscription, namely, by photography.

A full account of the alphabets is given in the third section with a good résumé of all the theories concerning origins and variations. While discarding the Greek tradition that Boeotia was the original home of the alphabet on Greek soil, Larfeld believes that the Phoenician letters were first adopted at Delphi about the tenth century and thence spread over Greece so rapidly that the complete form was not developed, but that additions were made in each separate locality. This presupposes that Delphi was an important trade and literary center as early as the Trojan War. The evidence does not bear out such a theory. The traditional account is as satisfactory as the one which Larfeld seeks to establish. If the Delphian priesthood had first adopted the Phoenician symbols they would have taken care that the tradition would be established giving the credit to Apollo. It is much more likely that Phoenician colonists adapted their native characters to the language of the subject people, which in turn imposed itself on the conquerors. The rapid spread of the new idea is more likely due to merchantmen than to the work of the priesthood. Various districts have different characters for certain sounds, usually non-Phoenician. In these cases the symbols were not transmitted by Greeks who were familiar with the sounds, but more likely by foreign traders. If the Phoenician merchants divided their Greek territory into spheres of influence in commercial relations we can readily understand how errors in transmission might have remained uncorrected in particular districts. No single theory, however, can explain all the divergences, some of which must have developed between the tenth and eighth centuries, when the art of writing seems to have been confined to a few who, writing on parchment, gradually developed certain characteristics in separate localities just as different styles of writing developed in the different monasteries of Europe.

More than a third of the book was taken up with formulas of Greek inscriptions. Here Larfeld's adaptation of his previous work is not only useless but senseless. To the general reader the formulas are without interest; to the specialist the abridgment is valueless for he must always consult the larger work to which Larfeld himself constantly refers the reader. There are also many meaningless abbreviations, the key to which can be found only in the main collection. It would have been better if this entire section had been omitted. The usefulness of the book would not have been diminished and the cost would have been materially reduced. Apart from this defect Professor Larfeld has carried out the abridgment of his larger work most satisfactorily.

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Homerische Probleme. II. Die Komposition der Odyssee. By DR. E. BELZNER. Teubner: Leipzig and Berlin, 1912. Pp. viii + 271. M. 8.

The second instalment of Dr. Belzner's *Homerische Probleme* (for review of Part I see *Classical Philology*, VII, 379) is to be classed, broadly speaking, with the work of Rothe (*Die Odyssee als Dichtung*), Drerup, and other representatives of the recent tendency in Germany to study the poetical intentions and methods of Homeric poetry as we find it, instead of seeking too curiously for inconsistencies and interpolations. Such minute analyses of plot and the art of composition doubtless bring out many interesting points of view that may escape the less critical reader and are a much-needed corrective to the excesses of disintegrating criticism. But in respect of the main issue, common-sense will always be justified in resting its case on the plain fact that, whatever flaws minute inspection may discover in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, there exist no better-composed long poems in the world. The perfect plot is merely a philologist's ideal. And similarly it is a quite sufficient reply to *chorizontes* ancient and modern to point out that world-literature offers no other example of two great poems by different authors so nearly alike as are the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

For the unity of the *Odyssey*, Dr. Belzner advances two main arguments: its dramatic construction about the central theme of the suitors' plot to assassinate Telemachus, and the breakdown of the disintegrators' contention that the action of book ii is inconsistent with Athena's advice to Telemachus in book i. On this point Belzner has discovered a knockdown argument. If Telemachus' first speech in the assembly were all he had in mind to say, it must by Homeric analogy and psychological necessity conclude with a *leidenschaftlichen Niedersetzen*. "Telemachus müsste sich nach ii. 79 eigentlich ostentativ niedersetzen." But he remains standing. And it inevitably follows that his further fierce warning to the suitors is not a new inspiration arising out of the debate, but the prosecution of the formed design with which he entered the assembly.

In addition to the analysis of the plot, and 130 or more pages of *Quellenanalyse*, Belzner's book presents an interesting study of the poet's art under the two chief heads of "Fortgeschrittene Technik" and "Primitive Technik." Apart from the repetition of formulas and other familiar topics, the chief example of "Primitive Technik" is the Homeric poet's alleged inability to narrate contemporaneous events. This favorite thesis of modern Homeric criticism Belzner develops with much acuteness. This is no place to set forth my reserves and skepticisms about the entire doctrine. I will content myself with one little illustration of the caution that should be observed in such inquiries. According to Dr. Belzner, the fact that "der homerische Dichter kann keine zeitliche Parallel-Szenen schildern" was "schon von Aristarch erkannt" as is proved by the scholion on *Iliad* xii. 1:

ὅτι τὰ ἅμα γινόμενα οὐ δύναται ἅμα ἐξαγγέλλειν. ἐν ὅσῳ δὲ οὗτος ἴατο, ἐκείνοι ἐμάχοντο. But is it quite certain that this is Aristarchus' meaning? A neighboring scholion explains (Dindorf i. 413) διαφόρους γὰρ πράξεις ἐν ἐνὶ θείναι καιρῷ ἀδύνατον, and this would surely seem to imply, not that Homer lacked *die sprachliche Mittel* to do it, but that the thing itself was impossible. The inadequacy of Homer's powers of expression is not an idea which an ancient critic would be likely to entertain.

PAUL SHOREY

Nemesios von Emesa: Quellenforschungen zum Neuplatonismus und seinen Anfängen bei Posidonius. By WERNER WILHELM JAEGER. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1914. Pp. xi+148. M. 5.

Neo-Platonism in one sense began with the first pupil of Plato, who hypostatized the symbolism of the *Timaeus*, the *Parmenides*, and the idea of good. In another sense it originated with the teachers of Plotinus. Its "beginnings" at any intermediate stage can be traced only by a *Quellenforschung* whose methods and postulates are still open to debate. Such inquiries rest largely upon two tacit assumptions: (1) later Platonists could not, or did not, consult the Platonic texts, but took their quotations always, as modern philologists do sometimes, at second hand; (2) each of them relied mainly on some one secondary source which, in spite of the enormous gaps in the literary record, we can discover by parallels in rhetorical, philosophical or Platonic commonplace. They followed their authority slavishly and were rarely capable of any intelligent interpolation or modification. These postulates make wild work in the study of Cicero's, Plutarch's, and Philo's relations to their sources. They are of course much more plausible in the case of a late and less significant writer such as Nemesios. But even here, I think, their systematic and uncompromising application may mislead.

Dr. Jaeger begins his investigation with the account of the psychology of φαντασία, etc., in Nemesios, pp. 171-73. The text and meaning of Nemesios here are in my opinion quite simple and present no serious problem. He gives first in his own terminology his own Platonizing eclectic view. The mind has three faculties, φανταστικόν, διανοητικόν, and μνημονεντικόν. This broad use of φανταστικόν for the generalized faculty of sense-perception and imagination is found also at the close of the preceding chapter. It can be traced back to Aristotle's *De anima* 432A, 31, and appears, I think, in the "Epicurean" psychology of Cassius in Plutarch's *Brutus*, chap. 37. Modern psychology would ratify it for many purposes. The words φαντασία and φανταστόν Nemesios appropriates for a particular imagination and the object corresponding to it. An "empty" affection, without objective correlate, he designates as φάντασμα. All this is commonplace of post-classical philosophic culture colored by Stoicism. But for a further Stoic

refinement Nemesios has no use. The Stoics' love of terminological symmetry led them sometimes to distinguish, not only the *φάντασμα* and the *φανταστόν*, but also their supposed subjective correlates. Corresponding to the unreal *φάντασμα* they assumed an unreal or "inane" mental state or faculty, the *φανταστικόν*, a shade of meaning suggested in part by general usage and passages of Plato's *Sophist*, but taken as a rigid distinction, practically superfluous from the point of view both of science and of linguistic convenience. It is the same faculty of the mind that is excited from within in the case of the *φάντασμα* and from without in the case of the *φανταστόν*. In hallucination, as in Aristotelian pure thought, the object and the mental state coincide. Usage may confound the two, or it may objectify the hallucination, but does not then really need a second term to designate its subjective aspect. Lucretius' dog waking from dreams pursues *inania cervorum simulacra*. This naïve confusion of subjective and objective works no practical inconvenience. And the appropriation of *φανταστικόν* for the subjective aspect or faculty of hallucination deprives us of a convenient synonym for the imaginative faculty as a whole. The word *φαντασία*, from Aristotle down, is sometimes used for a particular imagination, sometimes for the general faculty. Nemesios, adopting the Stoic distinctions thus far, uses it of a particular imagination answering to an objective correlate *φανταστόν*, employing *φάντασμα* for a hallucination that lacks such a correlate.

But though Nemesios (like Plutarch *De solert. an.* 3) rejects or ignores the special Stoic use of *φανταστικόν*, he proceeds to give the Stoic classification that results from this refinement of terminology and sets forth seriatim the Stoic definitions of *φαντασία*, *φανταστόν*, *φανταστικόν*, and *φάντασμα*. He adds dryly in the tone of Plutarch's and Cicero's criticisms of Stoicism that the difference is only a matter of terminology: *ἡ δὲ διαφωνία τούτοις περὶ τὴν ἐναλλαγὴν μόνην γέγονε τῶν ὀνόματων*. This apparently refers to their use of *φανταστικόν* nearly in the sense of his *φάντασμα*, and his employment of *φανταστικόν* for the entire faculty, and his neglect to provide an unnecessary special term for the "objective" sense of *φάντασμα*. All this, as I have said, was the merest commonplace for an educated Greek of the Empire. Nemesios may have learned it in the philosophical lecture-room, or refreshed his memory from some lost handbook. It is idle to seek for his sources.

Dr. Jaeger's dealings with this passage illustrate once more the pitfalls which vigorous and rigorous method digs for the feet of the most brilliant scholar. He begins by drawing up two sets of definitions in parallel columns under the respective rubrics *ἀνώνυμοι* and *Στωικοί*. This is slightly misleading, as it may induce the reader to suppose that Nemesios himself uses the heading *ἀνώνυμοι*, and it ignores the probability that the so-called "anonymous" definitions are simply the conceptions of Nemesios throughout his treatise, whencesoever derived. Dr. Jaeger next finds a problem in the fact that the order of Nemesios' definitions is not the same as that

of the four which he quotes as Stoic. It of course could not be, since Nemesios begins with the general faculty *φανταστικόν*. Dr. Jaeger's comment is: "Aber schon Nemesios oder seine Quelle bemerkt dass sie sich durch die Umstellung der Wörter . . . unterscheiden." I have already quoted and paraphrased Nemesios' words, and need only point out (1) that Dr. Jaeger's interpretation omits *μόνην* (i.e., *nur*), and (2) that *ἐναλλαγὴν* presumably does not mean *Umstellung* but rather the substitution of one thing for another, a change of terminology in short. It may of course sometimes mean *vicissim*, but it would not normally mean, and certainly does not here mean, the *Umstellung* of the items in the series. Dr. Jaeger's next point is "die befremdende Bestimmung des *φανταστικόν* als *διάκενος ἔλκυσμός* die in der anderen Reihe zum Phantasma gesetzt wird." This is not quite exact. Nemesios calls the *φάντασμα* a *πάθος διάκενον*, which he could well do, since he uses *φάντασμα* for particular cases of that which the Stoics designate generally as *φανταστικόν*, and for which he, as we have seen, felt no need of a general faculty name. It would perhaps be overrefining to suggest that he avoids *ἔλκυσμός* or *διέλκυσμός*, because, though he himself uses *φάντασμα* in the subjective sense of the *πάθος*, he instinctively felt that *ἔλκυσμός* was inappropriate to the objective coloring of the word in ordinary and in Stoic usage. At any rate, he does not use it of *φάντασμα*, as Dr. Jaeger's hasty sentence seems to imply that he does.

In the attempted solution of the problems he has thus raised, Dr. Jaeger proceeds to quote Chrysippus' definition of *φάντασμα* from Diocles of Magnesia in Diogenes Laertius 7. 50-51, *δόκησις διανοίας ὅσα γίνεται κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους*. His comment on this is: "Die *δόκησις* allein kann man beschreiben als *πάθος διάκενον ἀπ' οὐδενὸς φανταστοῦ γιγνόμενον* wie der namenlose Doxograph bei Nemesios es tut. Mit der Bestimmung bei Aetios vereinigt sie sich nicht so ohne weiteres." This is inexact. The words quoted occur in Nemesios, but they are not applied to *δόκησις*, a word which he does not use throughout the passage. There is, for the rest, no problem in *δόκησις διανοίας* if we only bear in mind the full meaning of the words. Both emphasize the unreal character of the phantasma. *Δόκησις* says that it is only an "opinion," merely seems real, and *διανοίας* that it is within, not without, the mind. This common meaning of *διάνοια*, often overlooked, is found already in Plato; cf. *Unity of Plato's Thought*, note 341. There is no difficulty in this. The only difficulty is that Chrysippus, as quoted by Diocles, seems to neglect the Stoics' own hairsplitting distinction between *φάντασμα* and *φανταστικόν* and uses *φάντασμα* for the subjective state. Aristotle often thus relapses from the strict observance of his own distinctions, and, if we may believe Plutarch, nothing was commoner in Chrysippus. Dr. Jaeger, however, proceeds to infer that the whole tradition of the distinction between *φάντασμα* and *φανταστικόν* as it now stands in our text of "Aetios," "ist falsch." The treatment of *φανταστικόν* as a noun, he thinks, is merely a mistaken deduction from its use as an

adjective in the definition of φάντασμα . . . ᾧ ἐφελκόμεθα κατὰ τὸν φανταστικὸν διάκενον ἑλκυσμόν, etc. Nemesios, he argues, perceived this error and partially corrected it. Nemesios' Stoic definition of φανταστικὸν (which omits the ἐστι of "Aetios"), he holds, is not strictly a definition, but a sentence in which the word is an adjective. Unfortunately for this theory, there is no probability that φανταστικὸν is an adjective in the sentence φανταστικὸν δὲ τὸν διάκενον διελκυσμόν ἄνευ φανταστοῦ. It is the third, not as in Jaeger's table the first, in a series of four sentences, in every one of which the corresponding word is a noun. It is obviously a noun, as Dr. Jaeger, if I have understood him rightly, admits in the corresponding nominative sentence of "Aetios," von Arnim, *Stoicorum fragmenta*, II, p. 22, quoted by Jaeger. Both are developments of the statement Χρίστιππος διαφέρειν ἀλλήλων φησὶ τέτταρα ταῦτα; and the other three members of the group are clearly nouns. As I explained in the beginning, the Stoic fondness for terminological symmetry would naturally make a noun of it to balance on the subjective side the objective φάντασμα, and so make finer or more explicit distinctions than the ordinary man requires. There is no basis, then, for the structure of hypothesis which Dr. Jaeger builds on this sentence.

It is clearly impossible to give to the entire book the kind of scrutiny I have bestowed on these three obscure and subtle pages. I have read it with interest, though with a growing sense of insecurity as I moved on from conjecture to conjecture up to the final apotheosis of Posidonius as the one transmitter to later antiquity and the Renaissance of the high authentic gospel of poetic and scientific monism latent in Plato's *Timaeus*. I suspect Dr. Jaeger of overestimating the influence of Posidonius, whom he celebrates with an eloquence that recalls the comment of Strabo on Posidonius' own style: *συνεθουσιᾷ ταῖς ὑπερβολαῖς*. On the other hand, I think he underestimates Nemesios, who, though not a critical modern philologist, was, like many of the later Greeks at whom it is the fashion to sneer, a fairly intelligent man. These, however, are too large questions to be settled in a review. I distrust the assumptions of the method of *Quellenforschung* and text analysis of which Dr. Jaeger is so brilliant a practitioner. But whether I am right or wrong in this, an occasional admonition as to the need of greater caution in the interpretation of the evidence can do no harm. I cannot believe that so competent a scholar as Dr. Jaeger would, if working less rapidly, and unpugged to the maintenance of a thesis, reaffirm all of the interpretations to which I have taken exception. But however that may be, students of Nemesios are not so numerous in these days that they can afford to quarrel. And I trust that Dr. Jaeger and his teachers will not misunderstand the frank liberty of signed criticism, which is the policy of this journal.¹ Its pages are always open to brief rectifications of any errors of fact in such a criticism. Opinions, of course, must differ. That is a part of the interest of the game.

PAUL SHOREY

¹ See *Classical Philology*, VII, 91.

Die Rede gegen Evandros (Lysias xxvi). Von DR. E. LEISI. Frauenfeld: Huber & Co., 1912. Pp. 17.

Modern criticism has assigned to Lysias several speeches which the ancient critics regarded as spurious, e.g., x, xxii, xxx; it has occasionally reversed the process and rejected one which was not formerly called into question (as, for instance, the *Epitaphios* ii). The foregoing study purports to be an investigation of the evidence for and against the authenticity of oration xxvi—the speech against Evandros, candidate for Archon, appearing before the official examining board at Athens.

An account of the purpose and character of these public examinations is followed by an illuminating discussion of the occasion and circumstances of the speech's delivery. A lucid translation is then given, which is virtually an interpretation of the text.

In his criticism of the oration Dr. Leisi observes its importance as a document for determining the state of mind which prevailed among Athenian radicals toward the erstwhile partisans of the oligarchy in the period following the Peloponnesian War. A few inherent chronological discrepancies are pointed out. There is an unusually large number of ἀπαξ λεγόμενα in the speech—words and constructions not uncommon in themselves, but not appearing elsewhere in Lysias. In the simple vocabulary and sentence-structure, the dearth of rhetorical figures, and even in smoothness and grace of diction, the speech measures up to the Lysianic standard mentioned by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*De Lys. Jud.* 3). In the adaptation of language to character and circumstances (ἡθοποιία), Leisi thinks the speech distinctly un-Lysianic. By his sincerity and the even tenor of his ways, the usual client in Lysias always commands respect and confidence; there is now and then a touch of playful, inoffensive humor, like that of the Cripple in oration xxiv. The speaker in oration xxvi is a violent and impetuous character, manifestly lacking in humor. He is disrespectful in his references to the judges. The grave charges brought against his opponent will many of them not bear the scrutiny of careful examination. That inherent convincing power (πιστικόν), ascribed to Lysias by Dionysius, is utterly lacking here. The similarity in form and matter to the Lysianic type, the striking dissimilarity in tone, and the unwonted failure of the language to carry conviction convince Dr. Leisi that the oration, while spurious as it stands, was probably originally adapted from a speech of Lysias.

The helpful exposition of collateral facts, the translation, and trenchant criticism make this investigation a welcome contribution to the scant literature on this oration.

J. E. HOLLINGSWORTH

WHITWORTH COLLEGE

MARTIN LUTHER D'OOGHE

IN MEMORIAM

American scholars lose one of their oldest and best-beloved colleagues by the death on September 12 of Professor M. L. D'Ooge. Though his physical vigor had slackened of late, the vivacity and gentle gaiety of his spirit were never more pleasantly manifested than just before his death. One day he greeted his friends with the geniality that endeared him to all; the next, he was no more—a veritable euthanasia.

Born in the Netherlands in 1839, he came to this country in early youth. Though he retained a lively interest in the country of his ancestors, he was heartily American in his feelings. He was graduated from the University of Michigan in 1862, and in 1867 became a member of the faculty, a connection which lasted until he retired in 1912. His residence was broken only by a period of study in Leipzig—where he heard, among others, Curtius and Lipsius, and took the doctorate in 1872—and again in 1886, when he was director of the School of Classical Studies in Athens. For over forty years he was active in teaching, and a host of pupils owe him their introduction to Greek life and thought.

Mr. D'Ooge was a man of varied interests. Traveling widely in his vacations, he knew men and cities of many countries. He shared the administrative work of the University, serving as dean for several years. In matters of civic, political, and religious importance he always bore his part. Particularly charming were his relations with younger people. Many of his junior associates recall with gratitude the hospitality and sympathy that he showed them when they were new to their surroundings.

Mr. D'Ooge's studies in Germany bore fruit in his editions of the *Oration on the Crown* and the *Antigone*, which have been used by thousands of students. But he is now best known by his scholarly work, *The Acropolis of Athens*, which embodies the results of years of study and of repeated examinations of the monuments. During the last year of his life he made a translation of Nicomachus' *Arithmetic*, which, it is hoped, may soon be published in a series of contributions to the history of science.

In all his work Mr. D'Ooge's attitude was that of a true humanist. Firm in his belief in the value of ancient thought to the modern world, he devoted himself with unflinching enthusiasm to the interpretation of the immortal poets and orators of Greece. For that labor of love, and for his gracious and amiable personality, his pupils and colleagues will gratefully cherish his memory.

C. B.

INDEX TO VOLUME X

- Agnostos Theos*, Norden 92 ff.
 α, Lesbian for ā and η 215 f.
 Alexander, romance of, and the Chadhir-legend, Friedlaender 336 f.
 Andocides *Orationes* ed. Blass 111 f.
angiportum, uses of 422
 antiquities, dictionary of, Geffcken and Ziebarth 115 f.
 Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, ed. Helm 357 f.; *Metamorphoses* ii. 30, reading defended 454 f.
 arbitrators, perjury before 1 ff.; handling of documents by 4 f.
 archaizing in Homer 161
 Arcestratos, expedition of 34 f., 44 f., 46-48, 52
 Aristeus, arrival in Potidaea 34 f., 44, 48 f., 52
 Aristophanes *Vesp.* 1141-42 discussed 326 ff.
 Aristotle, *De gen. et corr.*, archetype 211; *Meteor.*, title 194-95; MSS of 188-97; common descent of MSS 193-94; passages unwarrantably adduced as evidence of common descent 190-93; stemma 194-205, 211, 213, 214; relative value of MSS 211-13; archetype and other lost MSS 208-11; peculiarities of E 314 family 202-5; Greek commentators 193-94, 205-8; age of codex J 189; Bekker's edition 188, 213-14; passages discussed, 340b33 202, 341a9 194, 344a12 203, 346a9 194, 349a20 203, 350b28 202, 352b5 203, 354b25 204, 358b23 190, 358b30 203, 359b2 203, 360a26 204, 365b11 209, 366a31 214, 368b12 193, 370b27 198, 373a21-29 191, 375b22 203, 383b18-32 192, 384a30 203, 384b14-15 208, 386b3 210, 386b4-5 204, 210, 387a31 193, 387b27 192, 389b15 205; mediaeval versions of 297 ff.
 article as test of the Homeric language 159
 Attica, invasion of 35, 37 ff., 40 f., 43, 51, 52
 bee-culture in Vergil 406
 Beneventan script, Loew 99 ff.
biduum, meaning of 82 ff.
 Bithynicus, Pompeius, correspondence with Cicero 432 ff.
 Boeotians, four senates of 381 ff.
 Caesar in Gaul and Britain, Holmes 89 ff.; annals of, Sihler 344 ff.; school editions of *Bellum Gallicum*, Sleeman and Hodges 346 f.
 Callias, expedition of 34 f., 44 f., 48 f., 52
 Carteia 371 f.
 Catullus 95 interpreted 449 ff.; *doctus Catullus* 222 f.
 Chadhir-legend and the romance of Alexander, Friedlaender 336 f.
 Chronological table for 432-31 52
 Cicero, *De officiis* tr. Walter Miller 470; *De finibus bonorum et malorum* tr. Rackham 470; *Fam.* vi. 16, 17 (correspondence with Bithynicus) 432; Cicero's judgment of Lucretius 217; men's names in 386 ff.
Cippus Abellanus, note on 218
 cities of Noricum mentioned by Eugippius 172 ff.
cognomen 386 ff.
colonia Mariana 374
coloniae civium Romanorum, change in character 366
 colonies, distribution of in the provinces 378 f.; founded without special enabling act 375; ownership of land in the 373; of Ti. Gracchus 367; of veterans 374; colonizing plans of C. Gracchus, objections of senate to

- 368-71; colonizing plans of Rullus 376, of Caesar 376-79; transmarine 369-71
- Columella, indebted to Vergil 410
- comedy, Roman, wing-entrances in 411 ff.
- commercialism and colonial policy 367 f.
- constitutional antiquities of early Italian towns 108 f.
- contaminatio practiced by Seneca with regard to the confusing of literary types 139
- councils at Sparta 41 ff., 45, 50 f., 52
- Culex* 407; reading of 405
- Danube provinces, scene of the activity of St. Severinus 171 ff.
- Demosthenes, *Or.* xlv. 17 discussed 75 ff.; *Or.* xviii. 26 interpreted 77 ff.; *Orations*, Vol. I, ed. Fuhr 473; the will in *Apollodorus* vs. *Phormion* 76
- dicere non possum quam* 220
- Didache, studies on the Latin version of the, Wohleb 110 f.
- digamma as test of Homeric language 158 f.
- doctus Catullus* 222
- documents, handling of in public arbitrations 4 f.
- D'Ooge, Martin Luther, obituary notice 488
- Economic situation in Noricum as described by Eugippius 182 ff.
- elegiac poets, Roman, selections, ed. Harrington 362 ff.
- entrances, in Roman comedy 411 ff.
- essays by Skutsch, edited by Kroll 337 f.
- essays of Verrall 224
- Etesian winds 46
- etsi* 221
- Eucrates, Macedonian expedition of 35 f., 43-45, 50, 52
- Eugippius, and the closing years of the province of Noricum Ripense 166 ff.; biographical details 168 ff.; literary style 170 ff.
- Euripides, *Cyclops* 218, and *Odyssey* ix. 296-98 442 ff.; *Iph. Taur.* 64 ff. emended 81; *Hec.* 1013, Valcken-aer's correction accepted 82
- expectare donec* 221
- feminism 148 ff.
- fidem facere* 219
- frequentare discussed 217
- forum, significance of exit *ad forum* 425; location of exit *ad forum* 411 ff.
- Galba's principate, Barbagallo on 347 ff.
- Galen, works, edd. Mewaldt-Helmreich-Westenberger 350 ff.
- generals, Athenian 433-32, 53; 432-31 53
- genitive, partitive with neuter plural 220; with *προλαμβάνειν*, character of 77 ff.
- gens, familia* in Suetonius 445 ff.
- gladiatorial combats 147
- Gospels, primitive texts of, Clark 228 f.
- habere c. gen. pretii* 221
- Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, its account of the Boeotian league 381
- Hellenotamiai, payments for expeditions made through 36 f., 43 f.
- Herodotus v. 51 discussed 331
- Hippocrates *περί ἐβδουμῶν* and its versions, Roscher 352 f.; Roscher's views criticized by Boll 227
- History of Latin literature, Teuffel's, revised by Kroll-Skutsch 225 f.
- History of Greek literature, Meillet 229 f.
- Homer, caesura as aid to interpretation 438 ff.; *Od.* ix. 296-98, "unmixed milk," and Eur. *Cyc.* 218 442; composition of *Odyssey*, Belzner 482; Finsler on 235 ff.; oneness of the Homeric language 151 ff.
- Horace, attitude of, to Catullus 279 ff.; references of, to Tigellius 270 ff.; *Carm.* ii. 3. 17-20 interpreted 456; odes and epodes tr. by Bennett 467

horti, of the Romans 410
hyperbaton 27

Iliad, Odyssean books of the 155 f.;
Mēnis as kernel of 157; *Iliad* and
Odyssey, dissection of by means of
linguistic tests 151 ff., alleged differ-
ence in language 154 f.; studies on,
Bethe 339 ff.

Infinitive, historical, conditions unfav-
orable to it 54 ff.; its use in first-
century epic poetry due to Vergil's
influence 60 ff.; its use in Christian
poetry 64 ff.; peculiarities of its use
in late prose 67 ff.; its final disap-
pearance in verse 67, in prose 71-
72; list of passages where it occurs
after the Augustan age 72-74

inscriptions, Greek, collections for
illustrative purposes, Nachmanson-
Laudien 112; photographic repro-
ductions of, Kern 478; handbook of,
Larfeld, 479

Isocrates, influence on Cicero, Diony-
sius, and Aristides, Hubbell 238

Julian, works translated by Wright
231 f.

laurestinus, in Vergil 409

laurus silvestris 408

law, Attic, *see* arbitrators, wills

Lesbian α for \tilde{a} and η 215 f.

Letters, Seneca's a complete handbook,
loosely constructed, on the science
of living 149 f.; their method of
composition and their style 142 ff.;
wide scope of the 143 ff.

lexica, repertorium of Latin 357

"liturgical" element, the avoidance of
which by Seneca marked an epoch
139

Livy, book xxvii, ed. Campbell 240

Lucilius, his identity and character,
144

Lucretius, iii. 391 ff. 27 ff.; iii. 894-
930 29 ff.; the archetype of, Merrill
361 f.; corruption in the MSS of,

Merrill 361 f.; Cicero's judgment of
217

Lysias xxvi, Leisi 487

Maecenas, Seneca's aversion from ora-
tory of his type 144 f.

Maeterlinck, reaction toward Seneca
141

manere 221

Maximus of Tyre xvii. 8, emended
452 f.

Menander, "Ἀδελφὰ Δράματα (Fr. 734 K.)
26

milk, use of 442

military situation in Noricum as
described by Eugippius 176 ff.

montes, meaning of 409

Montesquieu, on Seneca 141

Morychus in Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1141-42
329

Mythology, *Omphalos*, Roscher 462

Names, men's in Cicero 386 ff.

Narbo Martius, establishment due to
commercial influence 372 f.; owner-
ship of land 373; outside of Italy 373
Nemesius of Emesa, Jaeger 483

nisi quod 220

Noricum Ripense, located 171; its
rivers 172; its cities 172 ff.; tribes
of barbarians in its vicinity 176 ff.;
military situation of 180 ff.; eco-
nomic situation of 182 ff.; religious
situation of 184 ff.; abandonment
of 186 ff.

Odyssey, language of the "contin-
uation" of the 157; studies on,
Thompson 101 ff.; illustrations of,
from ancient art, Müller 114 f.

oriental religious movements and
Christian origins, Norden on 92 ff.
orientation, Greek modes of 227 f.

Ovid, *Heroides*, Giessen codex of,
Roese 353 ff.; *Met.* 10.98 408

Palladius I. xxxvii. 2 405

Palma 371 f.

- papyri, Oxyrhynchian, school edition, Laudien 112 f.; *Halenses*, edition of 113 f.; *Iandanae*, Kalbfleisch 234 f.; Giessen, Kornemann-Meyer 234 f.; Hamburg, Meyer 234 f.; Lille, Jouguet 234 f.
- Pasion, his will and its seals 75 f.
- Peloponnese, Athenian expedition about 36-39, 52
- Perdiccas vs. Athens 47, 50
- peregre*, significance of exit 425; position of exit 411 f.
- periods of life, ancient views on, Boll 227 f.
- perjury, before arbitrators 1 ff.
- Petronius, sources of comic effect in 260 ff.; translation by Heseltine 349 f.
- Philocrates, archonship of 457
- philosophy, Posidonius and neo-Platonism 483
- Phormio, Potidaean expedition of 35, 41, 44, 45, 50, 52
- pinus*, corruption for *tinus* 405 ff.
- Plataea, date of attack upon 34 f., 37 f., 40 f., 46, 48 f., 51, 52
- Plato, *Epist.* vi spurious 87 f.; early works of, Pohlenz 96 ff.; von Arnim 334 f.; *Gorgias* 503D emended 325 f.; date of *Phaedrus*, Barwick 230 f.
- Plautus, entrances and exits in, *see* comedy; lexicon to, Lodge 96; *Miles Gl.* 393 f. 26
- Pliny, *N.H.* xv. 30 [39]. 127 408; xvii. 11. 60 408
- Pliny the Younger, MS tradition of the *Letters* 8
- politics, contrast between Roman and Alexandrian 145 f.
- Pollentia 371 f.
- Pollux, evidence for exits on Greek stage 412
- pre-Hellenic civilization, Dussaud 460
- Posidonius, *see* philosophy
- Potidaea, date of battle at 34 f., 41-46, 52; date of revolt of 34 f., 41, 45, 47 ff., 51, 52; siege of 36, 41, 50 f., 52; Athenian expeditions against 34-36, 41, 43 ff., 48 ff.; Aristeus at 34 f., 44, 48 f., 52
- praenomen* 386 ff.
- prepositions, as test of Homeric language 159 ff.
- πρόθυρον*, function of, in production of Greek plays 117
- πρὸ λαμβάνειν* with the genitive 77 ff.
- pronunciation of Latin, Westaway on 232 ff.
- prophecy as a dramatic motif, Staehlin 355 ff.
- provincial, the, his wealth, ability, and political prominence bring envy upon him 139 f.
- pseudo-Longinus *περὶ ὕψους*, studies on, Mutschmann 109 f.
- pseudo-Xenophon *πολιτεία Ἀθηναίων*, ed. Kalinka 332 f.
- quantum sciam* 221
- religious situation at Noricum in the days of St. Severinus 184 ff.
- rivers of Noricum mentioned by Eugippius 172
- Rigians, in the days of St. Severinus 177 ff.
- rus*, position of exit 430-31
- σάγμα* 327 ff.
- Salii, priesthood of, Cirilli 103 ff.
- Sannazaro, Jacopo, *Piscatory Eclogues*, ed. Mustard 471
- seals of wills 75 f.
- Seneca, *Apolocynosis*, translated by Rouse 349 f.; adverse reception of his style by contemporaries and immediate successors 140; character and career of, in the opinion of his contemporaries 140; his relation to the church, the Renaissance, the Elizabethan period, and the age of Rousseau 140 f.; independence, lack of indebtedness to one particular school, informality 142 f.; *Epp. mor.*, ed. Hense 105
- Sextus Empiricus, *Πρὸς Γραμματικούς* 126, emended 218 f.

slavery 146 f.

Sophocles, *Antig.* 1281, punctuation of 81 f.; translated by Storr 464 ff.

Statius, influence of art on the poetry of, Duncan 358 ff.

St. Augustine, Seneca shows the way toward his autobiographic method 142

St. Severinus, and the closing years of the province of Noricum Ripense 166 ff.

Suetonius, *De grammaticis* 5 emended 84 ff.; use of *gens* and *familia* in 445 ff.

syntax, Latin, studies on, Baehrens 106 ff.

Tacitus *Hist.* 1.40 discussed and interpreted 321 ff.

Terence, *Andria* 971-72 26 f.; entrances and exits in, *see* comedy

Teuffel's history of Latin literature revised by Kroll-Skutsch 225 f.

textual criticism, recent developments in, Clark 94 f.

Theocritus, *Id.* viii, defended as genuine, Rostagni 105; xxii. 31-32 interpreted 455

Thucydides, i. 61 emended 49; ii. 2 emended 35, 37, 46, 51, 52

Tibullus ii. 6. 8: addendum 456

Tigellius, in Horace *Serm.* i. 2. 3; i. 3. 4, etc. 270 ff.

tinus, the, in Vergil 405 ff.

treaties, Roman republican, Täubler 341 ff.

tribes of barbarians mentioned by Eugippius 176 ff.

uigilans dormire, somniare, stertere, etc. 26 ff.

Vergil, *Aeneid* ii. 377 29; *G.* iv. 112 emended 405 ff.; *G.* iv. 141 emended 405 ff.; numerical phraseology in, Clark 360 f.

Vetruvius, evidence for exits of Roman actors 411

wills, sealing of by witnesses 75 f.

Blank page with a vertical strip of text on the right edge, likely a page number or index.

VOLUME X

October 1915

PERIODICAL ROOM NUMBER 4

RECEIVED

OCT 22 1915

UNIV. OF MICH.
LIBRARY

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

A Quarterly Journal devoted to research
in the Languages, Literatures, History,
and Life of Classical Antiquity

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

Agents: The Cambridge University Press, London and Edinburgh; Karl W. Hiersemann,
Leipzig; The Maruzen-Kabushiki-Kaisha, Tokyo, Osaka, and Kyoto

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

CHARLES HENRY BEESON
ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER
CARL DARLING BUCK

PAUL SHOREY, *Managing Editor*
WILLIAM GARDNER HALE
GORDON JENNINGS LAING
ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER
HENRY W. PRESCOTT
FRANK BIGELOW TARBELL

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANK FROST ABBOTT, *Princeton University*
CHARLES E. BENNETT, *Cornell University*
WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *Wesleyan University*
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*
FRANCIS W. KELSEY, *University of Michigan*
WALLACE M. LINDSAY, *University of St. Andrews*
HANS OERTEL, *Yale University*

WILLIAM PETERSON, *McGill University*
SAMUEL BALL PLATNER, *Western Reserve University*
JOHN C. BOLFE, *University of Pennsylvania*
CHARLES PORTER SMITH, *University of Wisconsin*
ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*
BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER, *University of California*
JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, *Cambridge, Mass.*

VOL. X

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER 1915

No. 4

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|-----|
| The Colonizing Policy of the Romans from 123 to 31 B.C. | By Frank Frost Abbott | 365 |
| The Four Senates of the Boeotians | By Robert J. Bonner | 381 |
| Men's Names in the Writings of Cicero | By Harold L. Axtell | 388 |
| The <i>Tinus</i> in Virgil's <i>Flora</i> | By H. Rushton Fairclough | 405 |
| The Significance of the Wing-Entrances in Roman Comedy | By Eleanor F. Rambo | 411 |
| Cicero and Bithynicus | By Elmer Truesdell Merrill | 432 |
| Notes and Discussions | | 438 |

JOHN A. SCOTT: The Homeric Caesura as an Aid to Interpretation.—FRANK EGGLESTON ROBBINS: "Unmixed Milk." *Odyssey* ix. 394-38.—JOHN C. BOLFE: The Use of "Gene" and "Familia" by Suetonius.—RODNEY P. ROBINSON: Catullus 95.—PAUL SHOREY: Emendation of Maximus of Tyre xvii. 3.—A. F. BRÄUNLICH: Note on Apuleius *Metamorphoses* ii. 30.—EDWARD FITCH: Note on Theocritus xiii. 31-32.—ANDREW RUNNI ANDERSON: Note on Horace C. ii. 3. 17-20.—MONROE E. DEUTSCH: Tibullus ii. 6. 8: Addendum.—ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON: The Archon Philocrates.

Book Reviews

DUBAUD, *Les Civilisations préhelléniques dans le bassin de la Mer Égée* (Miller).—ROSCHE, *Omphalos* (Bonner).—STORR, *Sophocles* (Shorey).—BENNETT, *Horace: the Odes and Epodes* (Woodman).—MILLER, *Cicero De Officiis*; RACKHAM, *Cicero. De finibus bonorum et malorum* (Kellogg).—MUSTARD, *The Pseudo-Cicero Eclogues of Iacopo Sannazaro* (Norlin).—FUEB, *Demosthenis Orationes* (Adams).—KREH, *Inscriptiones Graecae* (Johnson).—LARFELD, *Griechische Epigraphik*. Müller. *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Johnson).—EILERTSEN, *Homeric Problems. II. Die Komposition der Odyssee* (Shorey).—JAEGER, *Nemesis von Emos: Quellenforschungen zum Neuplatonismus und seinen Anfängen bei Posidonius* (Shorey).—LIMAI, *Die Rede gegen Evandros* (Lysias xxvi) (Hollingsworth).

In Memoriam, Martin Luther D'Ooge

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University Press. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.00. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$3.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.04); for all other countries in the Postal Union, 25 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$3.25); on single copies, 6 cents (total \$1.06). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press, and in case a check is drawn on other than a Chicago or New York bank to add 10 cents to cover a charge which we are obliged to bear as the cost of collection. For this reason postal or express money orders or bank drafts are preferred as forms of exchange.

The following agents have been appointed and are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C., England. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 13s. 3d. each; single copies, including postage, 4s. 4d. each.

For the Continent of Europe: KARL W. HIRSCHMANN, Königsstrasse, 29, Leipzig, Germany. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, M. 13.00 each; single copies, including postage, M. 4.50 each.

For Japan and Korea: TEN MARZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Tori Sanchoon, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 6.50; single copies, including postage, Yen 2.15.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when they have been lost in transit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Entered as second-class matter, June 30, 1905, at the Post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

